1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND		
3			
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
5	LORI FRANCHINA *		
6	VS. * APRIL 6, 2016		
7	* 9:30 A.M. CITY OF PROVIDENCE *		
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * PROVIDENCE, RI		
9			
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN J. McCONNELL, JR.,		
11	DISTRICT JUDGE		
12	(Jury Trial - Volume I)		
13			
14	APPEARANCES:		
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: KEVIN P. BRAGA, ESQ.		
16	Law Office of Kevin P. Braga 2095 Elmwood Avenue, Suite B		
17	Warwick, RI 02888		
18	JOHN T. MARTIN, ESQ. BENJAMIN_H. DUGGAN, ESQ.		
19	KJC Law Firm, LLC 10 Tremont Street, 6th Floor		
20	Boston, MA 02108		
21	FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN F. McHUGH, ESQ. KATHRYN M. SABATINI, ESQ.		
22	City Solicitor's Office 444 Westminster Street, Suite 220		
23	Providence, RI 02903		
24	Court Reporter: Karen M. Wischnowsky, RPR-RMR-CRR One Exchange Terrace		
25	Providence, RI 02903		

1	I N D E X	
2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS	<u>PAGE</u>
3	<u>Olayinka Oredugba</u> Direct Examination by Mr. Martin	65
4	Danielle Masse	03
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Martin	144 162
6	Cross-Examination by Mr. McHugh Redirect Examination by Mr. Martin	181
7	<u>Lori Franchina</u> Direct Examination by Mr. Martin	188
8	Diroce Examinación by III. Hai eili	100
9		
10		
11	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
12	PLAINTIFF FOR ID	IN FULL
13	1	69
14	3 10	73 110
15	11 12	115 120
16	14 15	126 85
17	16 17	98 131
18	35	78
19		
20		
21	<u>DEFENDANT'S</u> FOR ID	<u>IN FULL</u>
22		69
23	A P 170	172
24		
25		

6 APRIL 2016 -- 9:30 A.M.

(The jury is present for the following.)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Actually, I should have stopped you because I need for you to rise because the first order of business today is for Ms. McGuire to swear you in as jurors.

(Jury sworn.)

THE COURT: So, ladies and gentlemen, before we begin with opening statements this morning, let me do what I'll do every morning, you'll get bored with this, but I'm going to do it, ask you first can you all assure me that you didn't do any outside research on this case? Great.

Can you all assure me that you didn't discuss this case with anyone? Can you all assure me that you didn't mention anything about your jury service on social media? And, lastly, can you all assure me that you didn't see any reference to the case on any news items, news stories or whatnot? Great.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to just begin very briefly to tell you about Ms. Franchina's claims. We call this a precharge. And sometimes I do it, and sometimes I don't.

And when I talk to jurors afterwards, they said it would be helpful if they at least had a framework of

what the law was so that they could then listen to the evidence that came in with that information in that it would have helped them better understand the evidence as it came in and maybe to try and place it within that.

So let me -- and, again, this is very brief.

And at the end of all of this, I'm going to give you very extensive jury instructions to follow; but this is just as a way to maybe assist you as you hear the arguments and then the evidence that comes in.

So, Ms. Franchina brings two claims against the City of Providence. First, she claims that the city, through its employees and agents, subjected her to on-the-job harassment and a hostile work environment based on her gender.

Second, she claims that the city retaliated against her for having made discrimination complaints.

Those are the two claims that will be before you.

Now, Ms. Franchina has to prove her claims by a preponderance of the evidence. That means that she must prove that her claims are more likely than not to have occurred.

And, again, we're going to discuss the burden and the proof at the end of this case more extensively; but that, in general, is the Plaintiff's burden.

Now, to prove her first claim for harassment and hostile work environment based on gender, Ms. Franchina must establish the following: One, that she's a member of a protected class; two, that she was subjected to unwelcome sexual harassment; three, that the harassment was based upon her gender, the statute says based on her sex, based on her gender; fourth, that the harassment was sufficiently severe or pervasive so as to alter the conditions of her employment and create an abusive work environment; fifth, that the sexually objectionable conduct was both objectively and subjectively offensive and that a reasonable person would find it hostile or abusive and the victim, in fact, did perceive it to be so; and then lastly that some basis for employer liability has been established.

Now, to prove that the City of Providence is liable for her second claim, that is, the retaliation claim, Ms. Franchina must establish that she engaged in protected conduct, meaning that she made a discrimination complaint; two, that she suffered an adverse employment action; and three, that there's a causal nexus that exists between Ms. Franchina's protected activity and the adverse employment action.

Now, specifically Ms. Franchina must show that she would not have suffered the adverse employment

action but for the exercise of a protected right. If an adverse employment action was taken, the city will have the opportunity to prove that it was taken for a legitimate, nonretaliatory reason.

Now, Ms. Franchina would also need to show that she suffered damages in order to recover under either of those claims.

So, ladies and gentlemen, your duty now is to pay attention to the attorneys, listen intently and closely to the evidence and see it as it comes in so that you can later decide, after your deliberations, whether the City of Providence is liable to Ms. Franchina on either or both of these two claims.

Again, as I told you, I will give much more detailed, lengthy instructions to you on the law at the end. We're going to now turn to opening statements. I want to again tell you opening statements are not evidence. They are oftentimes very helpful for you to then understand where the Plaintiff and then the Defendant believe the case is going to go and how they want you to perceive the evidence that comes in and what results, obviously, they would ultimately like at the end of it, but it is not evidence.

The evidence will begin once the opening statements are completed and you begin to hear from the

witness stand and see the evidence that is introduced at trial. Okay?

With that, Mr. Martin, are you prepared to give your opening statement?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. Thank you.

THE COURT: Great. The floor is yours.

MR. MARTIN: Good morning again, everyone. So I'm sure that there were many places that you would have rather been yesterday or many things that you would have rather been doing; but I found it really enjoyable to hear from everybody, some more than others. If I didn't ask you enough questions, I apologize.

I do agree with Judge McConnell that from time to time we will have an opportunity for some enjoyment here in the courtroom over the next two weeks, at least I hope so, but now's the point where our job is to get to work and take on the serious business of proving our claims to you.

And the first thing I want to say to you is that we believe that this is a case that's really about rules. We believe that there's a rule, that there's a law that no employee should ever be subjected to a hostile work environment and that their employer must prevent it when they find out about it.

We believe that no employee who is engaged in a protected activity of making a complaint about discrimination or harassment should be retaliated against; and if they are retaliated against, then the employer must prevent it.

And Judge McConnell will instruct you on those rules. We colloquially refer to them as Title VII. You'll hear about rules that the department and the City of Providence themselves put in place to prevent those types of things, but here's the important thing about rules. They only work if people enforce them.

We're going to prove three things to you over the next two weeks: Number one, that Lori Franchina was harassed over several years.

Number two, we're going to prove to you why she was harassed. It was because of her gender plus her sexual orientation, number one; and number two, it was in retaliation for having complained about harassment and discrimination in the past and concurrent with right before she left work.

And before I describe to you how we're going to prove those two points, I'd like to tell you the story that brings us here to the courtroom today.

Now, some time ago, I'm not sure when and I'm not sure that it matters, the City of Providence

decided to employ an Equal Employment Opportunity person, I guess you could say, or investigator or officer. And this person is charged with enforcing their sexual harassment policy, their equal and affirmative -- excuse me, their Equal Employment Opportunity policies.

This person is charged with investigating complaints of those types of things; but what this person is not authorized to do, at least not with the fire department, they're not authorized to actually discipline anyone whom they found to have violated those laws.

What they are allowed to do if they find that somebody's violated the law is make a recommendation to the chief; and then it's the chief's choice to follow the recommendation, to give less punishment, to give more punishment, to give no punishment at all.

They have a complaint procedure in which people who believe that they may have been discriminated against or they may have been harassed are encouraged to make complaints directly to the EEO officer.

However, if they decide to go through the chain of command and make those complaints to a chief or to a captain or to a superior officer, there is no rule that the superior officer or the chief is required to

forward that on to the EEO officer.

And if a chief declines or fails or refuses to follow the recommendations of the EEO officer, there's no enforcement mechanism to make sure that they do so. So that's the general system that you're going to learn about.

Enter Lori Franchina. Lori grew up here in Rhode Island. She has a family with a sister and a brother and a mother and a father. From a very early age, she was very hard working. Her first paper route was at the age of 12.

Her father, Anthony, is a cobbler who worked here in Rhode Island for many years and now works in New York. She was immediately recognized as being very athletically gifted and very caring like her mom, who is a nurse.

She went to college in eastern Connecticut and was a sports superstar. She went to the NCAA Final Four twice in softball. She was a basketball player. And she was a fighter.

She tried out for the Olympic team; but before she tried out for the Olympic team, in one of her last seasons in college, she got hit with a bat. Her face was completely smashed. She had to go through reconstructive surgeries. Six months later, she's back

on the court with a facemask.

She got her degree in emergency medical services, and she immediately went to work as an EMT. When she saw the opportunity to work for the Providence Fire Department, she thought it was perfect. The pay was great. The hours were great. The uniform looked excellent. She was thrilled to have an opportunity.

She went through the academy. She passed everything. She did everything she needed to do, and she got herself a job riding around with the Emergency Medical Services division of the department.

And her work was excellent. There's no doubt about that. In fact, normally you have to wait at least five years before you're even eligible for a promotion to lieutenant. Lori was promoted to lieutenant before that five years was up, which of course came with a big pay raise.

Now, right around the time that she was promoted to lieutenant, another important event happened. It's probably worth noting that you'll hear in her testimony that things weren't necessarily perfect during those first five years. There was some issues with whether or not there were men's rooms or ladies' rooms. There were some incidents where maybe people weren't particularly thrilled to be working with women, but

nothing major, nothing that she complained about, nothing that's really important to this case.

But what happened towards around August or September of 2006 is she got scheduled to work with a guy named Andre Ferro.

So Ferro immediately jumped into the truck, and he turned around and he said, Lori Franchina, my lesbian lover. You and me like the same thing, you know, and that's -- and then he used a foul word for female anatomy. And she was shocked. And she said, I don't know what makes you think that's okay, but it's not okay with me.

And then he continued to ask her if she had a girlfriend, if her and her girlfriend would like to spend time with him intimately. He asked her if she was going to have babies. He asked her whether or not she used sexual toys, if she would prefer to have him serve as the sexual toy. And it was a rough shift for her because it pretty much continued throughout 12 to 14 hours.

It culminated at the hospital where in front of another male on the department he pulled down his pants and tweaked his nipples and again said, Lori, my lesbian lover, in front of nurses, patients, her people.

So what happens with lieutenants is, your shifts are so long that you actually have an office with a bed. You sleep away from the regular bunk, and there's a computer in there. So they go back, he goes up to the bunk with the subordinates, and she goes down to her office, and she undresses, and she gets into bed.

Next thing she knows, she wakes up and he's in her room. And he's sitting with his feet up on the desk wearing a short pair of shorts, she wasn't sure if they were boxer shorts or not, and he's scratching himself and again asking her -- I shouldn't say "again." Asking her if she had any problems with what he had said earlier and if she wanted to talk about her problems with what he had said earlier. After three or four times of yelling at him to get out, he left.

So here's what's interesting, is that Lori never complained about this. Lori didn't want the retaliation. Lori didn't want to deal with any issues. Lori didn't want any problems. Lori wanted to work.

But the male firefighter who had seen what he did at the hospital went and told the chief because he knew it was bad. The chief's name is Curt Varone.

There's going to be a lot of names that come up during the course of this trial, too many for anybody to learn during this opening statement. I'll try to

throw out important names when they arise, and some other people I'll just refer to generally.

Curt Varone is very, very interesting because he was on the department for many years. He also became trained as a lawyer. Right now what he does is he's a chief in a different department, and he's an expert who goes around and teaches different departments about what they're supposed to do in circumstances like this.

And what he did was he immediately filled out what's called a Form 17, and that's a form you use in the department in order to make complaints to go up the higher ranks.

He filled out a Form 17 about everything that he'd learned. He interviewed Lori. He went directly to Andre Ferro. He said, Don't do it again. I'm bringing you up on charges. If I hear any more complaints like this, it's over for you.

He brought him through the disciplinary process, and Andre Ferro was fired. Later he ended up getting his job back through a grievance, but that's not a big part of this case.

Lori never had a problem with Andre Ferro again.

Curt Varone handled everything appropriately, and Curt

Varone immediately went into action to prevent

retaliation. He told her captain of the house, Al

Horton, If there's any retaliation whatsoever, I want to know about it. I'm going to take care of it. He told Lori, If there's any retaliation whatsoever, I want to know. I'm going to take care of it.

Now, around the same time, Lori started to notice things that were happening at the station that hadn't happened before. She had a new nickname. Her last name is Franchina. She's started hearing people referring to her as Frangina.

She would walk down the hallways, and she would hear people say, What's that bitch doing here or why is that bitch with us? She would hear people saying -- calling her the C word. So she complained.

And what she learned during the meetings was that it wasn't retaliation. It was because of her management style, that she was too pushy, that she was too assertive, that she was too strict, that the guys didn't like the way she ordered them to do their jobs. That's what she learned.

So she started doing extra meetings with
Chief Varone in order to improve her management style
and learn about leadership. He took this very serious,
but the problems continued.

They made out a list on the whiteboard in the station of 21 things that they did not like about Lori

Franchina, 21 things ranging from appearance to -honestly, she doesn't even remember what was on there.
She refused to give them the satisfaction of wiping it
down or looking at it or acknowledging it in any way.

But what you'll learn in this trial is that before all this stuff started happening, a firefighter, a very experienced firefighter from that station, had said to her, Who the fuck do you think you are? Are you trying to cost him his fucking job?

What you'll learn that Lori didn't know at the time was that the captain of the house, Al Horton, knew that Andy McDougal had said, Are you trying to cost him his fucking job? And after he said to her, Are you trying to cost him his F-ing job, Andy usually did the cooking at the station, he would stop making her food for the meals. They cooked for everybody there.

So Captain Horton went and said, What are you doing with the food? This better not have anything to do with her complaint.

And Captain Horton will admit that all the guys were angry, that he was worried about retaliation because they were so angry, and he ordered Firefighter McDougal to continue to cook for her.

But what's interesting is, Captain Horton never told Chief Varone about what he heard Andy McDougal say

about costing Andre Ferro his F-ing job. What he told Chief Varone was that he thought that Firefighter McDougal stopped cooking for her because Lori didn't compliment his cooking or thank him for his cooking when he cooked.

So what happens is, on the rescue, they're usually unable to eat with everybody else because they're constantly going. So all the guys will eat up or all the firefighters and EMT people, there's usually only one woman on a shift, you'll learn about why, they would all eat together and they would put out plates with tin foil marked "rescue lieutenant," "rescue tech." That's the assistant. And a rescue tech is usually, I believe, and I might get some of this stuff wrong, a rescue tech is usually a firefighter who assists the rescue lieutenant.

So she starts getting sick on her shifts, terrible diarrhea. Never had a problem with that before. And this is at the same time she's seeing the things on the board and she's hearing the things about her name. And she's starting to notice that when she orders people what to do at a scene, because when it's a scene that's involving somebody who needs to be transported to a hospital, it's the rescue lieutenant who is in charge, even in charge of the firefighters.

So she thinks it can't possibly be related. So she starts switching the tags on the plates, and all of a sudden her rescue techs start getting sick. So she stops eating completely with them.

Things got so bad that Captain Al Horton went to Chief Varone and requested that Chief Varone not transfer Lori Franchina but that he transfer every single male out of that station and replace them with other men; in other words, to leave Lori alone in the station and bring in a whole new team and Captain Horton and his team go somewhere else. That's what he's testified to already.

So that's all happening in around 2007. Towards 2008, she moves to a station and she hopes for a fresh start. So she gets out on the scenes, and wouldn't you know it, once again people aren't listening to the things she says. People aren't following her orders.

She's noticing -- there's an interesting thing about the bathrooms at the stations. You know, some of these buildings are old. This is a department with a lot of history. So a lot of them don't have enough facilities to have a men's room and a women's room. And that's fine. That's not really a part of this case.

They tried to make up for it. One way that they

made up for it was that they would put a sign on the door with a chain. On one side is the male, on the other side is the female. So what you do is, if a female comes up to the door and you see the man, you have to knock. If nobody answers, you can go in. Same thing if a man sees a female, you have to knock.

So anyways, if you're a male inside of a bathroom and you hear somebody knock, you know that it's a female.

Lori started noticing that when she would go into the bathroom, the seat, the floor, the handles, the facilities are covered with urine, which, of course, she has to clean up before she can use them.

She's continuing to hear people call her
Frangina. She's continuing to see her subordinates
refuse to acknowledge her when she comes into a room.
This is a paramilitary organization. The treatment of
subordinates to superiors is very important. You'll
hear a lot about that.

And the insubordination is taking on new levels. For example, in one case a male firefighter came up to her, and lieutenants have bars on their collars, flicked her collar, pointed in her face, said, I will never fucking take orders from you, you're a doughnut, and he stared until she walked away.

It started to happen on the runs. She would show up. She would be waiting for a report. They wouldn't give her reports. The reports would be wrong. They wouldn't bring the equipment that she was asking them to bring. They wouldn't follow her orders. They would argue with her in front of patients, in front of civilians.

In one instance she brought a tech with her where there was an infant who was in the middle of a cardiac event that needed to be defibrillated. It's very important. There are different settings of electricity that can be pumped through a body. One is appropriate for adults. Much lower for infants.

Her co-worker started to put the paddles onto the baby's body without changing the settings. She said, You can't do that. He said, I got it. She said, Wait, don't do it. He said, I don't need your help. She said, Stop. He said, You're not in charge of me. She had to literally push him away from the baby's body in order to stop him from sending that electricity through the baby's body.

In another incident she showed up for a car accident. It was an off-duty police officer in the driver's seat. The fire lieutenant on the scene had called for a special piece of equipment to cut the roof

off of the car. He had never left his truck to inspect the car. Everybody was waiting for the equipment to come before they could start performing emergency medical services on the police officer.

Lori could see that he was bleeding, gasping for breath, in a very dire medical condition; and she realized in the dark of night that the car was a convertible. So her -- she ordered another firefighter to help her open up the convertible so that she could start doing CPR, which unfortunately failed.

And after she did that, the other lieutenant said, Don't ever fucking take over my scene. You will never tell me what to do. You will never tell my guys what to do.

In another instance, she went to a home in which there was a young man, adult, like 20s, who was exhibiting behaviors consistent with a drug overdose. She ordered her firefighters to go get a stair chair and a collar to bring him down on a piece of equipment so that it would be safe. They refused. They wouldn't listen to her. They were arguing with her assessment.

His roommate or girlfriend was yelling, Why won't you help her? You're going to hear so many times when citizens were yelling, Why won't you help her?

They decided to carry him without the chair.

They dropped him. His genitals fell out in front of his family. They brought him down the stairs. They got him to the hospital, and it turns out that he had had a brain bleed, which is something different than a drug overdose. I don't know if he used drugs or alcohol or not, but it's something different than that.

On another scene they showed up, there was someone who had a self-inflicted gunshot wound to the head. She realized that he had a pulse. It was viable. She'll tell you that it's not her duty to call who lives or dies. It's her duty to get them to the hospital and let them do what they can do.

She immediately ordered her men to start boarding him onto the chair so that they could get him to the hospital. And they'd say, Are you kidding me? He's dead. Look at him. She said, No, he has a pulse. We have to get him. They said, If this guy wanted to kill himself, why should we stop him?

Finally she got them to do it. He was covered in blood. He was slippery. They dropped him a couple times. There was nothing intentional about them dropping him. It was because of the blood.

They got him into the back of the unit. There was her and two firefighters, Sean McGarty and Paul Tang. They're covered in sweat, end of July,

Providence night, hot, humid, carrying a heavy body, covered in blood, brain matter. It's a scary, terrifying scene.

Sean McGarty positions himself at the back door of the unit as he's supposed to. Lieutenant Franchina is performing CPR to keep the pulse going. More an experienced firefighter, Paul Tang, is yelling at her, What's her problem? Look at us. Look at him. We can't save him. And she tells him, It's not your job to decide who we save. It's your job to follow my orders.

And he takes his rubber glove, and he holds it right up to the side of her face, and he snaps it, covered in blood. She had just said to him, You're covered in blood. Change your gloves. Help me perform CPR. He held it right in her face, and he snapped it.

She felt blood, brain matter, chips of bone cover her face, run into her eyes. She was closing her eyes. She could feel as she was inhaling through her nose some type of matter coming in and out with each breath.

She couldn't open her eyes because she was afraid to let more blood in. She couldn't wipe her hands because her own hands were covered with blood, plus she had to keep doing CPR.

So the next day she went out on stress. And for the first time she talked to a psychologist, and the psychologist treated her and talked to her. He listened to the types of scenes that she had seen as a firefighter, he listened to the types of scenes she had seen with her co-workers, and she learned that she had a disease called post-traumatic stress disorder. It's incurable but treatable, and it's severe.

And she stayed out on leave, got all the treatment that she could. She was doing yoga, exercise. She was staying in contact with the chiefs. She was going to therapy. She did everything she could to get back to work.

She gets back to work in December; and after two days back, she goes to the union hall to buy some fire department clothes and stuff on sale so she can give them to her family for gifts, and for the first time she runs -- since that run she runs into Sean McGarty. You remember he was the one who was at the back of the door.

And he says to her, Do you have a fucking problem with me? She said, How you doing, Sean? And he said, You're a nobody. You're a fucking zero. You're a fucking doughnut. Who are you to complain about what we did? You knew he was dead. Who are you

to complain to them about what we did and say we do nothing? He started screaming at her.

You'll see him. I believe he's being called as a witness by the defense. He's a large man, pointing at her, swearing, spitting. He's admitted to those things under oath at a restraining order hearing. He admits to swearing, to yelling, to screaming at a superior officer, a female superior officer who is probably about half his size, maybe two-thirds of his size.

She looks over to his superior officer, Elliot Murphy; and she says, Lieu, are you going to help me? Are you going to stop this? And Elliot Murphy goes, What am I, your fucking baby-sitter? And he walks away.

There's another guy there, Robert Jackson.

She's like, Bo, that's his nickname, will you stop
this? She's trying to get to the door. Firefighter
McGarty is blocking the door, continuing to yell,
continuing to point.

Finally he storms away. She walks by Elliot Murphy and (gesturing) on the shoulder and she goes, Thanks for all the help, Lieu. Just like that.

She immediately calls the police. They have a hearing in court. A lifetime restraining order is

granted against Firefighter McGarty. Four people showed up to testify for him: Elliot Murphy, a lieutenant; Bo Jackson, a lieutenant; Michael Evora, firefighter; Sean McGarty himself.

After the four of them denied that there was any assault or any threat or any dangerous situation, a Superior Court judge granted a lifetime restraining order.

Now, what's really interesting, there was no way for Lori to know this at this time, but you'll learn during the trial, is that Elliot Murphy, 16 hours later, because of this, Thanks a lot, Lieu, filed an injured-on-duty report saying that he'd suffered bruises and contusions on his shoulder.

All four of those firefighters, Evora -- maybe I'm wrong about Evora. Let's take him out.

Mr. McGarty, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Murphy all filed reports saying that Lieutenant Franchina had assaulted Elliot Murphy, and they testified consistently with that at the restraining order hearing where the restraining order was granted.

So at this time now, Lori just fights through it. She doesn't leave for stress. She comes back to work, and it's more of the same. Month after month after month, run after run, they don't do what she

says.

Finally come October of 2010, she can't sleep, she can't eat. She's constantly fighting with her partner, Kristy Adams. Her family is walking on eggshells around her. Her sister is not letting her children around her. She's deciding -- she's consistently speaking with Chief Crawford and other chiefs about what's going on, will anybody help me, will anybody take care of this; and her rescue tech, a nice kid -- I shouldn't call him kid, a nice guy named Jared Scolaro said, You know, when I got the papers to work with you, I got a hundred phone calls. Lori learned that it was a hundred phone calls from other people in the department, and he let her know that they shouldn't ever expect any help from any firefighter when they go on any scene.

So let me take a step back. I'm sorry. It's hard to keep it all straight. After the lifetime restraining order was granted, the department gave an internal order that said Firefighter McGarty should never be allowed to work at a station where there's a rescue.

Not every station has a rescue. That's how they would keep them apart. He would only work at the stations without a rescue. She only works at the

stations with a rescue. Nobody's allowed to schedule him at a station with a rescue. Nobody's allowed to schedule her at a station without a rescue. Pretty easy, simple solution.

So back to the end of October. She talks to her doctor. She gets the paperwork. She goes -- has everything to go out on stress leave to seek treatment again, more intensive treatment. She continued treatment right throughout the entire time. And she gets to her station, and she walks through, and she hears a voice saying, Hey, Cap, I'm feeling a little stressed out. Do you think I could go on medical leave, too?

She hears somebody reply, Yeah, yeah, I know what you mean; and then she hears the same voice go, Can't stand that fucking bitch. What is she doing here with us?

And she comes around the door, and it's her chief who said, Yeah, yeah, I know what you mean. And you could all probably guess who was saying, I can't stand that fucking bitch. What's she doing here with us? It's Firefighter McGarty working at her home station with a rescue in direct violation of the fire department's order.

I want to be clear about that. We're not

alleging that he violated the restraining order. He was scheduled to be there by the city, by the fire department. He didn't go seeking Lori. He had no reason to know that Lori was going to be there filling out paperwork that day, but it was the department that put him there.

So she goes and she complains to the captain of the house, Al Horton; and Scott Mello, the chief who was there, comes down and apologizes to her.

And again she goes through intensive treatment until finally her doctor says, You know, you can't do this job anymore. You're not emotionally or psychologically capable of being an emergency medical services professional anymore. You freeze in front of pressure. You overreact to things that aren't necessarily as threatening as they appear. You aren't sleeping. We have to prescribe you seven different types of medications just to help you function throughout the day. It is a danger to you and it is a danger to the people that you want to treat for you to continue with your career.

So she went through the process, and she was deemed to be totally and permanently disabled because of post-traumatic stress disorder caused by two separate things, number one, the traumatic events that

she had seen and, number two, the harassment that she endured. That's what her doctors will tell you, Dr. Michelle Olson and Penelope Yanni.

So all those events there is how we're going to prove harassment. How are we going to prove that it was because of sex, because of gender, because of orientation, because of retaliation?

You will learn during the course of this trial things that she could have never known then because behind the scenes when she complained in 2009, one of the chiefs, Chief Crawford, went to the EEO officer, remember I talked about them earlier, and said Lori has a complaint of a hostile work environment, and she started an investigation.

During her investigation, she learned a couple of things. The first one, that there was a problem overall with more than one female lieutenant. I'm not exactly sure how, she doesn't remember, but there were at least two female lieutenants who were complaining that the men were being insubordinate to them. No evidence that it was happening to any of the male lieutenants.

Number two, she learned from Chief Crawford that the men treat certain women better than the other women. To use his exact words, She's a lesbian, and

they know that they don't have a chance with her. If they have a chance with you, they'll cut you a little more slack; but if they don't have a chance, no slack. That's what the chief said.

So then when Ms. Oredugba, that's the EEO officer, when she finds out about what had happened in December, she went and she found out that they were going to file charges against McGarty. She made a recommendation you must also file charges against Murphy and Jackson, the two guys who refused to help her.

Now, remember, she only has the authority to make recommendations for violations of the EEO policy. She doesn't get to tell firefighters or emergency techs what to do. She doesn't discipline them for rule violations or policy violations, only for EEO violations. She advised punish both of them. She never advised punish McGarty because they had already decided to do it. That's going to be her testimony.

On December 22nd, they tell her, Yeah, no problem, we're doing it. Over the next month or so, based on her conversations with them, she believed that every -- each one of those men had been brought up on charges, had a hearing and had been disciplined.

You can imagine her frustration and dismay in

May of 2010 when she found out that none of that was true and when she found out that the reason that they didn't do it was because they thought that the case was proceeding to litigation.

So in May she told them, That's not a good enough reason, you have to discipline these guys. To this day, she doesn't know if they were ever disciplined. To this day, I don't know if they were ever disciplined.

I do know that when people are disciplined, there's a memo that goes out to the entire department. Lori continued to get those memos through 2013 before she was deemed to be disabled. Lori never saw a memo about anybody getting disciplined for what happened to her.

During 2010, another investigation was started by Ms. Oredugba. You'll see that report as well. And she concluded -- I shouldn't say she concluded. In November of 2010, she wrote an e-mail memorandum to herself in which -- this is Exhibit 17, Plaintiff's premarked Exhibit 17, in which she was talking to Chief Crawford, who was the chief of Emergency Medical Services for the City of Providence Fire Department at the time, that he reported to her that Chief Crawford believed 90 percent of what Lori was saying was true.

He believed that 90 percent of the complaints that they were investigating were true; and he told the EEO officer that he believed there to be, and I quote, "ample merit to her claim of multiple and repeated violations of PFD," Providence Fire Department, "multiple and repeated violation of PFD rules and regulations. It even seems plausible that the pervasiveness of this behavior creates a hostile work environment for her. It also seems clear that the Providence Fire Department has failed to stop the behavior."

Unfortunately, by this time she was already disabled and she couldn't come back, even though she wanted to. And, in fact, she still wants to be an EMT, but she can't.

So that's how we're going to prove to you that it was based on sex and gender and orientation, number one, because the women who were available for dating or who the guys had a chance with were treated better than she was. She was unavailable. She's gay. And that's consistent with what the EEO officer learned about other female lieutenants.

You know that it's retaliation because she engaged in a couple of different protected activities, number one way back when Ferro got fired, but number

two when Ms. Oredugba was investigating her complaints. That was also protected activity, her complaints to Ms. Oredugba in July of 2009, in December of 2009, in January of 2010, all of those things.

You're going to learn that Chief Crawford or it might have been Chief Farrell told Ms. Oredugba during her investigation, and I want to make sure that I get the words right, this is Exhibit 17 again. Yes, this is Chief Crawford. The problem is -- what he wrote is, "We must put a stop to it. You punish one officer, which makes that officer's subordinates angry and they want to retaliate against Franchina," et cetera, et cetera and so forth.

I'm not sure how he knew that because no officer was ever punished, but it's clear that his concern was that she would be retaliated against. That's how we prove those things.

The last part is damages, and that's something more for the end of the trial, I think; but I'll tell you what we're looking for. Number one is, we want her wages from the day that she was forced to retire until the age of 62, which is the normal forced age of retirement.

She made about 120 to 130 thousand dollars a year as a lieutenant, and she would have been able to

work for about 19 more years had she not been forced to retire.

We're going to ask you to compensate her for her emotional distress because we're not talking about a little bit of aggravation or the types of things that you would normally expect at work. We're talking about an incurable, debilitating psychological illness that she lives with and everybody who loves her will live with for the rest of her life.

And, number three, we're going to ask you for punitive damages, the type of damages that are to punish and deter behavior.

Judge McConnell will explain the very specific circumstances in which those are allowed, but suffice it to say there are certain circumstances in which you can find that their behavior was knowing and willful or reckless of her rights. And if you find that to be so, you can punish them; and you can do that to not only punish them but to deter future conduct, to protect the community.

Members of the jury, at the end of this trial,

I'm going to ask you for the type of verdict that does

all of those things because the rules that the city had

in place, the rules that the Providence Fire Department

had in place were perfectly capable of protecting Lori

Franchina but only if they're enforced.

When we talked yesterday about the red light, when you go through the red light and you hit someone, who should be accountable. They didn't not know about the law. They didn't not have the capabilities to protect her. They chose not to protect her.

At the end of this trial, the only thing I'm going to ask you to do is enforce the rules that they refused to enforce because if those rules don't protect Lori, they don't protect anybody.

Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Martin.

Mr. McHugh, about how long? I'm just worried about whether we should take a break now. Are you going to be much more than a half hour?

MR. McHUGH: I might be, your Honor. Not too much more.

MR. MARTIN: Sorry, was that way too long?

THE COURT: No, no, no, fine.

Ladies and gentlemen, why -- normally we take a break at 11, and I doubt the snacks -- Mike, are the snacks here yet? Oh, they are.

So we're going to do it early just because what I don't want is around 11:00 people get antsy and need to use the facilities or whatnot in the middle of an

opening statement.

So let's take our morning break now. And please remember don't discuss anything that's taken place, don't discuss this case in any fashion while you're together, and we'll see you back in about 15 minutes.

THE CLERK: And could you just leave your notebooks in your seats. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me assure you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, and I forgot to tell you this at the beginning, the notebooks are yours; and as I told you I think yesterday, they're to use as you want or not use as you want. It's purely your personal preference.

But know this, they're only yours. No one will ever look at them. They are left on your seat every night. Vickie puts them away safely; and at the end of the trial, they're destroyed without being looked at.

So you can use them or not use them as you wish; but always leave them on your chairs when you come and go from the courtroom until deliberation, and you will have them with you during deliberation. Now we can all rise for you.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Mr. McHugh.

MR. McHUGH: Thank you, your Honor.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I will prove to you that Lori Franchina's problems on the Providence Fire Department were not because of her sex, not because of her gender, not because of her sexual orientation, but because she could not get along with her fellow firefighters, both female and male firefighters.

And I will prove to you that Lori Franchina had a reputation within the Providence Fire Department among both the male and the female firefighters of not being able to get along with her fellow firefighters and being very difficult to work with.

I'll also prove to you that Lori Franchina also had problems dealing with family members of victims or patients that she was called to the scene to take care of, and that also caused friction between her and her fellow firefighters.

You're also going to see that Lori Franchina never took advantage of the process for filing complaints of discrimination and harassment through the EEO officer in city hall even though she knew from the time she was in the fire training academy, which was 2002, how to do it because every recruit, and we'll put on some people who were in her recruit class at the training academy, every recruit is given at least one

session while they're in the Providence fire training academy on how to file a complaint of discrimination or harassment with the EEO officer in city hall. She didn't do it.

And we will also show that she knew from her tenure on the department how to do it because we also give training to the incumbent firefighters from time to time on how to file a complaint of discrimination or harassment within the fire department.

And even though she first complained about harassment in the training academy in 2002, it wasn't until August 11th of 2009, seven years later, that the EEO officer for the City of Providence first learned that Lori Franchina had complaints about the way she was being treated.

And the EEO officer, Ms. Oredugba, didn't find out from Lori Franchina that Lori Franchina had complaints. She found out from Chief Crawford. And Chief Crawford told the EEO officer that Lori Franchina had come to him to complain to him about this incident with Firefighter Tang in the rescue and the blood.

And, look, we all know there are two sides to every story. You're going to hear our side of the story when it's time for us to put our witnesses on.

And I will tell you right now that Firefighter Tang is

going to get on this witness stand and he's going to tell you a completely different story about what happened in the back of that rescue with those gloves and that blood than Lori Franchina is going to tell you.

Firefighter Tang is going to tell you at the end of the run, yes, there was blood splattered, which is not unusual because of the amount of blood. He's going to tell you he never snapped his gloves. He took his gloves off the normal way. Those gloves are tight on your hands; and when you take them off and there's some fluids on them, they can splatter.

He's going to tell you it's not unusual to have a lot of blood in the rescue; and that's why after there is a rescue run and there's blood in the rescue, the entire truck is decontaminated before they take that truck out again.

He's going to tell you not only that -- and he's going to tell you that he's the one who was giving CPR to the individual in the back, not Lori Franchina.

And he's going to tell you at the end of the run, after the person had died and they were at the emergency room and Lori Franchina walked out of the emergency room and Firefighter Tang was at the truck waiting, he's going to tell you that she went out of

her way to go over to Firefighter Tang and say to him, Congratulations, you did a great job.

And he's going to tell you that he was shocked days later when he was called on the carpet by a superior officer and asked, What happened on that rescue run? Lori Franchina is accusing you of snapping your gloves in her face and splattering her with blood.

And he's going to tell you he couldn't believe it, this came out of nowhere after she had already congratulated him on doing a good job.

Make no mistake, Lori Franchina did know how to complain even though she had not complained to the EEO officer. And we know that because, and we talked about this somewhat yesterday, injured-on-duty pay, workers' comp., when Lori Franchina decided that she thought she should get injured-on-duty pay, 100 percent of her pay tax free, and the department wouldn't give it to her, she went to the union and she filed a grievance.

She knew how to do that. Even though she didn't file a grievance on any of these other harassment actions that she complains of, she knew how to do it. She just didn't do it.

Now, as I said, we all know there's two sides to every story; and we'll get our turn, and you'll hear our witnesses. But I wanted to go over a few examples

of the problems that Lori Franchina had with her fellow firefighters as well as the families of victims and patients, and you're going to hear some testimony.

There's going to be -- if we added up the experience of some of the firefighters who are going to testify here at this trial, we'd have over 100 years of firefighting experience among all these witnesses.

Let's start with the North Main Street Station, which is right behind this courthouse. You've driven right by it, I'm sure, many times across from Roger Williams Green. That's where she went for Engine 5.

Early on in her career, as Mr. Martin said, she was making more money than a first-grade firefighter because she had already had the EMT certification; and there was a number of vacancies in the EMT service, and so she was assigned to be an acting lieutenant.

And you really have to understand the culture of the fire department to understand this case because a fire department is very different from the jobs all of us have.

The firefighters spend a lot of time together.

They spend days together, nights together given their schedule. They eat together. They sleep together.

They watch TV together. They go to the grocery store together to get groceries for the department -- for

their station, rather. So they spend a lot of time together.

Let me give you one example of an incident between Lori Franchina and one of the male firefighters at the North Main Street Station.

You're allowed to sleep during your shift if you don't have a run whether you're a firefighter or a rescue person. At the end of your shift, if you're still asleep and there's no run, someone will wake you up and say, Your relief is here, your relief being the person who is taking your place.

There was a firefighter who was supposed to wake up Lori Franchina on one of these days. She slept past her relief. He fell asleep himself. He was asleep in a chair, and she came out and in front of other firefighters kicked the chair hard because she was angry that she was still at the station, not supposed to be working, her relief was there and this firefighter didn't tell her.

After that incident, they changed the practice at the North Main Street Station over here; and the practice became to use the loud speaker to announce to firefighters, Lieutenant Franchina, your relief is here, or whoever the firefighter may be. So that's just one instance. That, of course, caused friction

among the firefighters.

Now, let's talk about this problem with the meals. There's usually one firefighter who does the cooking. They call him the chef. And usually it's someone who likes to cook and takes that on himself. And they will eat together, some with the food prepared by the chef, some people will bring in their own food.

The rescue is a little bit different because the rescue is much busier than the fire truck; and there's so many runs and they're out of the station so much, it's not atypical to have a rescue run finish the run, not come back to the station, go to the next run, maybe go to the hospital and then go to the next run.

So it's estimated by some of the firefighters that people who are on the rescue may only be in the station 10 to 15 percent of the time.

A firefighter by the name of Andy McDougal was the one who was cooking at North Main Street, and he enjoyed cooking so he would prepare the meals. For the rescue personnel, if you weren't bringing in your own food and he was going to prepare yours, yeah, he would put it aside, mark it.

He got word that Lori Franchina was complaining. She didn't like the way the food was prepared.

Sometimes when she got there, it was cold already. He

didn't -- she didn't like the way the food was being stored.

At some point in time Firefighter McDougal had had it and he said, I'm not going to cook for her anymore. He didn't say he was going to exclude her from meals. He said, I'm just not going to cook for her anymore, she doesn't appreciate it, she's always complaining.

Lori didn't complain to Captain Horton, who is going to testify here, who later became a chief and retired as a chief. Captain Horton heard of it from other firefighters.

So Captain Horton takes it upon himself to go into the station that day, walk up to Firefighter McDougal and says, Listen, you're going to cook for everybody who wants to eat here. You're not going to choose who you cook for and who you don't.

And he explained to Captain Horton, She's always complaining, she doesn't appreciate it. He said, You're going to cook for Lori Franchina just like you're going to cook for everyone else. And that was the end of it.

He then got the men together and sat them down and had a talk with them about everybody has to work together. It's important. We're a team. We all have

to be able to get along together.

And now and again there were complaints about

Lori or Lori would complain about some other

firefighters, and Captain Horton would work on this and

pretty much straighten it out.

And so for a while Captain Horton thought that things were going pretty well in the North Main Street Station on that group with Lori Franchina and the other firefighters.

He went to a fire -- another fire station over on Rochambeau Avenue for a call sometime after this, and one of the other firefighters said to him, What's going on with Lori Franchina? I heard she's going down to headquarters to see Curt Varone, Chief Varone, to complain about having problems in the North Main Street Station.

Well, this was news to Captain Horton because he thought he pretty much had everything on an even keel and there hadn't been any problems. So at that point, like Firefighter McDougal had had it, he had had it.

He drove down to see Deputy Assistant Chief Curt Varone, who was his supervisor; and he told Chief Varone, Look, I don't know what else to do. I've gotten the men together. I told McDougal he has to cook for her. There haven't been any more complaints.

Things have been going well. We've been getting along. I don't really know what the problem is. At this point I'm going to ask you to transfer my group, not every person in the station, but the fire department has different groups working out of different stations.

So he said, I am asking you to transfer -- leave Lori there and transfer my group out of the station to another station. And he didn't ask that they be replaced with men. He simply asked that they be or volunteered that they would be transferred.

So he goes back to the North Main Street
Station. The next thing he knows, he sees Lori
Franchina back at the station at her locker cleaning
out her locker; and he says to her, Lori, what's going
on?

Let me back up a minute. When he got to see -in to see Chief Varone, Chief Varone said, Yeah, she
called me and she's coming down here, but let me handle
this before we do anything.

So Lori said to him, I'm going to make it easy for you guys. I'm transferring out of here.

Now, it turns out that Chief Varone had been coaching, he called it, or counselling Lori Franchina for a while almost on a weekly basis about how to get along with fellow firefighters; and he was

concentrating on two areas that she was having problems with.

One was the way she talked to people in a very condescending, arrogant way and the other one saying -- the content of what she was saying to people that would hurt people's feelings. So those are the two things that Curt Varone saw in her that were causing her problems on the job. And this was going on on a weekly basis. Captain Horton didn't know about that.

So Lori agrees that she will transfer, and she goes to the Branch Avenue Station where later on there's this incident with Firefighter McGarty. So that's the end of her tenure at the North Main Street Station on Rescue 5.

Now, in the meantime, while she's at Branch Avenue or even before she gets to Branch Avenue, there are several incidents or I'll give you a couple of the incidents where she had trouble with, while she was at the North Main Street Station, dealing with the family members of patients. One of these incidents happened on Jewett Street, which is over behind the State House.

Now, you have to understand another thing about the fire department. The rescues are so busy and out of the station, there's also a fire truck -- at least one fire truck in each station they call an engine

company. So every time there's a call for a rescue, they will send an engine company, which they call first responder.

Now, all our firefighters are trained as EMTs also. Some have additional certifications on the rescue called EMT-C, which is a cardiac, different certification. So very often it's the engine company that arrives first at the scene rather than the rescue.

And basically what happens is the officers on the rescue -- on the engine company will assess the patient, take the vitals, see what's wrong with the patient and then wait for the rescue to get there.

So on this particular day when they got to

Jewett Street, there was a young mother and her

daughter; and she had given the daughter Benadryl, and
the daughter had an allergic reaction to the Benadryl.

The mother was very upset. The daughter was very

upset. Captain Horton and his crew calmed the mother

down, calmed the daughter down.

When the rescue arrived with Lori Franchina,
Lori Franchina marched into the house in a very
militant way and started interrogating the mother and
said to the mother, What did you give her? And the
mother said, I gave her Benadryl. How much of a
dosage? I gave her a swig. And then she said, Well,

you can't be doing that.

And right away a scene that had become calm and less stressful became much more stressful for the mother and for her daughter because of the way

Ms. Franchina was speaking to them; and that, of course, caused tension among the firefighters, also.

Another example took place across the street at Providence Place Mall. At Providence Place Mall, there was a call for a young boy, a young Hispanic woman who didn't speak much English, for a -- her son who cut off the tip of his finger, got caught in one of the doors at the mall.

So when you go into the mall from the street and you go up on the escalator, right at the first level there before you get into the level of the stores or by Old Navy is the security office. So they had brought the mother and her son into the security office.

Captain Horton again and his crew arrive first.

They got in there. The mother, of course -- there was blood. The boy was crying. The mother was upset. The boy was upset. They assessed the boy. They took his vitals. And they calmed the mother down, they calmed the son down while they waited for the rescue.

Again Lori Franchina shows up and marches in in a very militant way and says to the mother, Has he had

a tetanus shot? And the mother said, No. And she said, Well, he could die from this.

So right away, again, a very calming situation that had been taken care of by Captain Horton and his crew becomes a very stressful, tension-filled situation because of the way Lori Franchina acted towards the mother and the son. And the other firefighters, of course, are standing there witnessing this.

Those are some of the -- a couple of examples of the problems she had dealing with patients and their family members.

Now, I'm going to talk a little bit about her lack of complaining to the EEO officer for whatever reason because she had complained before early on to immediate supervisors, which I'll talk about in a minute; but if I could have the ELMO turned on, please, your Honor, if I may.

THE COURT: Sure. Ladies and gentlemen in the back row, you'll see that there are monitors. If you just twist it and push it forward -- it won't break. Trust me. Well, don't trust me. Just push it all the way forward. It will stop. And then for the folks in the front row, you should each have one that operates. Great. And the machine there is what we refer to as ELMO. It allows you to video-see documents.

Mr. McHugh.

MR. McHUGH: Thank you, your Honor.

I'm going to show you, this has been marked as Defendant's A. This is one of the agreed-to exhibits.

Defendant's A, you're going to see this again later, but I wanted to show you the city's sexual harassment policy. You don't have to read the whole thing now because we'll talk about it later, but I wanted you to see that this is what the recruits get and what the city employees get and incumbent firefighters get so there's no doubt on how you go about filing a complaint if you feel you've been harassed.

And there's three pages to this. I wanted to draw your attention -- I'll show you page 2, also, but -- it talks about also down at the bottom prohibiting retaliation, but I wanted to show you in particular for the purposes of opening statement the third page where they get the complaint procedure so that they know specifically what it is.

So on the third page, if you look right at the beginning at the top, you'll see "complaint procedure." And you can see there that they have actually the name of the EEO officer, Olayinka Oredugba, who is going to be the first witness, where she's located, her number

and her actual extension.

And then they go on to tell employees complaints of sexual harassment are accepted in writing. They prefer that these be put in writing so they can conduct their investigation and have something in writing in front of them and that -- you can go on the city's website to get a complaint form or you can call or e-mail Ms. Oredugba and ask for her to send you a form.

So you have the phone number with the extension, you have the website, and you have the e-mail of Olayinka Oredugba who can help you with this complaint; but in addition to that, if you look at that last paragraph in the complaint procedure, you can also skip that if you want per the policy or on your own and you can file directly with the Rhode Island Commission for Human Rights.

So I just wanted you to be aware that this is what firefighters and police and city employees see in terms of how do I go about filing a complaint.

So on August 11th, 2009, this is the first time that Ms. Oredugba gets this complaint from Chief Crawford from Lori Franchina. She still hasn't heard from Lori Franchina about Firefighter Tang doing something that he's going to tell you he just didn't do. It just didn't happen.

But in the course of it, Chief Crawford puts, and I think this e-mail was referenced, that in the course of complaining about this incident in the rescue with Firefighter Tang, Lori Franchina also started to tell him about other instances of harassment that she had experienced.

And you'll see that Chief Crawford told her,
Here is Olayinka's number. You should call her. You
should go in and see her. That was August 9th.

By August 20th, Chief Crawford checks, and Olayinka Oredugba still has not heard from Lori Franchina nine days later. And, remember, this incident with Firefighter Tang goes back to July 29th. So it's almost a month later.

So Ms. Oredugba calls Lori Franchina herself, and they set up an appointment for September 14th, 2009. Ms. Franchina never shows up.

So Ms. Oredugba does her own investigation. She goes and she meets with Chief Farrell at the time, the chief of the department, tells him apparently there's been a complaint of Lori Franchina that was made to Chief Crawford but not made by Lori Franchina.

She sits down with Chief Farrell, and then Chief Farrell says that he is going to order all his assistant chiefs and he is going to tell his assistant

to be treated the same, there shouldn't be any problem working with anybody else, and I want you chiefs to tell your firefighters and officers the same thing.

Now, she doesn't hear from Lori Franchina again until December 13th. This is after the incident at the Firefighters' Hall. And there's a voicemail left from Lori Franchina on Olayinka's phone saying that she had to go and get a restraining order against a firefighter, Firefighter McGarty, because she had an altercation with him at the union Christmas bazaar over on 90 Printery Street right behind Benny's, we all know where Benny's is off North Main Street, and she would like to come in and meet with Ms. Oredugba.

So Olayinka sets up a meeting for her the next day, December 14th, and Lori Franchina never shows up for that meeting either.

Now, before I even talk more about this incident at the union hall, there are a couple of other complaints that Lori Franchina had made early on, right from the beginning she started complaining in the training academy, that were handled by her supervisor or the training staff right away.

The first one was she was cleaning the bathroom at the training academy; and while she was cleaning the

bathroom, one of the male recruits came in and used the urinal. She complained to the academy staff about that. The academy staff called together the whole class, I think there were 35 for that class, talked to him about it, told him he didn't want this going on, this couldn't go on, and they set a time every morning, 8 a.m. to 9 a.m., for the bathroom to be cleaned and no one was to use the bathroom between 8 and 9 a.m. And that took care of it. That didn't go any further. That never happened again while she was at the training academy.

There was one other complaint she had at the training academy, and that was about male trainees talking about women being the weaker sex. Again, they called the group together of 35, and they tell them, We're not going to have this kind of stuff going on here, we don't want that kind of talk, we're not going to tolerate it, it's going to stop; and that was the end of it. So when she complained initially in the training academy both times, it was taken care of right away.

Now, what about this incident with Andre Ferro?

Again, the complaint didn't come from her, but it came from another firefighter to Curt Varone. When the city found out that Ferro had pulled this, what did they do?

They fired Ferro, fired him. Didn't suspend him, didn't reprimand him. They fired him.

He used the same process under the collective bargaining contract, because, remember, the firefighters are unionized, that Lori Franchina used under the collective bargaining contract to get her 100 percent tax-free pay, the grievance procedure and then, when the grievance was denied, asked for arbitration, which was his right under the contract.

It was an arbitrator through an award after a hearing that ordered Ferro to come back to work even though the city had fired Ferro.

Now, let me talk a little bit about this
Firefighters' Hall incident. That Firefighters' Hall
incident was at the union's property on 90 Printery
Street. Lori Franchina was off duty. It was not
something that was sponsored by the city. It was not
something that the city itself took part in. It was
purely a union function.

When Lori Franchina went to Superior Court and attempted to get a restraining order, we know that she got one. Immediately upon learning that there was a restraining order, Chief Dillon, chief of the department, issued an order through an e-mail.

That's Exhibit G, your Honor, if I could put

that up, please.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. McHUGH: Now, if you can see that at the top, that's from Chief Dillon. The subject is Lori Franchina, Lieutenant Franchina, and he says in the e-mail that she's obtained a restraining order against McGarty; but he also says the order's not in force during emergency responses but is in force in the station.

So, in other words, if Rescue 3 or Rescue 5, whatever rescue Lori Franchina is working on, is sent to a working fire and, wherever McGarty is working, his truck is there, that's fine; but they don't work together, and he doesn't get assigned to the same station that she does. And then it talks about they can respond to emergencies together, but they can have no other contact.

And admittedly in this e-mail Chief Dillon is talking about it presents a problem for call-backs.

Call-backs occur when somebody is on vacation, out sick, and they need someone to cover. So they will call back, literally call back firefighters who are on a day off and pay them overtime.

Different people at different times will be assigning the call-backs. Now, there's over 400 -- at

the time over 400 firefighters in the Providence Fire Department. Not everyone who is assigning a firefighter to a call-back is going to have in mind Chief Dillon's order of one particular firefighter out of 400 firefighters.

So if you look at number one, the order from Chief Dillon was he's not to be given a call back in a station that has a rescue assigned so that there wouldn't be any contact with Lieutenant Franchina in the station, in parentheses, if she is subbing or a change of shift and then, number two, that McGarty was not to be detailed to a station that had a rescue assigned so there could be no possibility of them working together; and number three, McGarty was to be notified, and it's his responsibility under this order to tell who's ever doing that substitution that he's not to be assigned if Lori Franchina was there.

Number four is important, too, because number four says these directions are issued to ensure the safety and wellbeing of both members, both McGarty and Lori Franchina. So the department acted swiftly and tried to make sure that the two of them were separated.

Now, the interesting thing about Lori Franchina on this October 28th day is she's in the station filling out the paperwork, again, to get IOD, saying

that -- this is in 2010 now, saying that she's had a reoccurrence of the stress that she experienced with the incident with Firefighter Tang, which never happened, you're going to find out, and she's in the station.

She's not scheduled to work on the 28th. She's not there on a call-back. She's not there on overtime. She walks into the Branch Avenue Station to fill out the IOD paperwork to try to get her 100 percent tax-free pay every week.

So when she gets there, as she gets there, she knows McGarty's in the station. She stays there for several hours anyway. She stays in the Branch Avenue Station for several hours knowing that McGarty is in there on a call-back.

Somehow someone who was scheduling the call-back missed this order from the chief or didn't realize that Lori Franchina was assigned to that station, but it really didn't matter because she wasn't working that day anyway.

Even though she stays in the station for several hours, at some point she decides to go with Mr. Martin and Mr. Braga across the river to the Superior Court and allege that because McGarty -- the Fire Department has assigned McGarty to a call-back at the Branch

Avenue Station, this is a violation of the restraining order and they want McGarty held in contempt.

So they have a hearing in front of Judge Gallo; and, guess what, Judge Gallo says, No, this is denied. There is no contempt.

If I could show that on the ELMO, that order, your Honor.

THE COURT: You can, but you might check the name of the judge on it.

MR. McHUGH: So here's the order denying the restraining order violation based upon the incident on October 28th. So the hearing was before Judge Gallo, but Judge Gibney signed the order.

So Lori Franchina was trying to blame the department for a violation of the restraining order by McGarty when she wasn't even scheduled -- not only not scheduled to work that day but happened to be in the station and stayed there for several hours even after she saw him.

Now let's talk a little bit about the alleged damage aspect of this case. We know she's alleging post-traumatic stress disorder, we know she's alleging emotional distress, and we know she's looking for you to award her money.

And we're going to have to keep in mind at the

time or I'm going to ask you to keep in mind at the time that damages are discussed and there's evidence on damages that her IOD tax-free pay was \$1,246.66 per week. The department had initially denied it; and I told you she went to the union, the union filed a grievance, and they ended up coming to an agreement on that grievance just at the time she was going to retire.

So she actually received three-and-a-half years' back pay of injured-on-duty pay. In fact, she had to amend her tax returns because the pay she had gotten was taxable; but when she got the three-and-a-half years of the IOD pay, that was not taxable.

Today she's receiving her pension since

December of 2013 from the fire department, and that is
\$2,063.81.

The other thing that you have to remember when she's asking for damages or putting in evidence of damages is that she's worked very little since 2013, a job -- a per diem job at \$25 a day cutting lawns. She hasn't really looked for work, and she's never applied to any of the other 30 or so fire departments in the State of Rhode Island or work as another EMT for any other fire department.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, I told you at the

beginning that Lori Franchina had trouble getting along with male and female firefighters, that she has a reputation for being difficult to work with both male and female firefighters, and I'm going to present two rescue lieutenants as witnesses in this case.

They stand in the same shoes and one of them went to the same academy as Lori Franchina. They stand in the same shoes that Lori Franchina sat, rescue lieutenants who work with men and women who have women -- who have men working under them, men working above them, and the rescue tech is assisting the lieutenant and drives the truck. That's the job of the rescue tech.

Both of these individuals, Lieutenant Teresa Wishart, who is still on the Providence Fire Department, and Lieutenant Andrea Stuckus, who is still on the Providence Fire Department, are going to tell you that in their entire tenure on the Providence Fire Department as firefighters, as rescue techs, as rescue lieutenants, they have never been harassed by any male firefighter, they have never been harassed by any male officer, they have never been harassed by any female firefighter, they have never been harassed by any female firefighter, they have never been harassed by any female officer.

The next time I will speak to you will be in my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

closing argument; and at that time, ladies and gentlemen, I will ask you to return a verdict on behalf of the Defendant, the City of Providence. Thank you. Thanks, Mr. McHugh. THE COURT: MR. McHUGH: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Martin, is the Plaintiff ready to open its case and call its first witness? MR. MARTIN: Yes, your Honor. The Plaintiff calls Olayinka Oredugba. THE COURT: Someone is going to need to tell her. You can come forward, ma'am. If you just come by the witness stand over here and remain standing, Ms. McGuire is going to swear you in. OLAYINKA OREDUGBA, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN THE CLERK: Would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record. THE WITNESS: Olayinka Oredugba, 0-R-E-D-U-G-B-A.

THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.

THE COURT: Ma'am, if you'd just make yourself comfortable, pull the chair in so that you're comfortable and, once you get comfortable, take the microphone and the base, everything moves about it, and you can also move this up and down. So just speak

1 right into it when you speak. 2 THE WITNESS: Like this, your Honor? 3 THE COURT: That's great, but you can pull it 4 closer towards you so you don't have to lean. 5 great. Mr. Martin. 6 7 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. 8 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 9 BY MR. MARTIN: 10 Q. Good morning. 11 Α. Good morning. 12 Q. Can you hear me okay? 13 Α. Yes, I can. Thank you. 14 Q. So can you tell the jury what you do for work. 15 I am the Equal Employment Opportunity officer for Α. 16 the City of Providence. 17 Q. When did you start doing that? 18 Α. Approximately 2006. 19 And tell us a little bit about your Q. 20 qualifications, where did you go to school, 21 professional licenses, stuff like that. 22 I am a member of the bar of Rhode Island. Ι 23 attended law school at Roger Williams University School 24 I attended undergraduate at University of of Law. California, Santa Cruz. 25

- Q. Now, when you say you're a member of the bar, that means you're a lawyer?
  - A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Now, in your capacity as the -- did you say your job is the EEO officer?
- 6 **A.** Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

22

23

24

- Q. Tell me about the rankings in your office. Are you the top EEO person? Is there anyone above you?
  - A. I am the EEO person. The Director of Human Resources is above me.
    - **Q**. Okay. So are you responsible for all EEO office investigations and recommendations for the entire city?
    - A. With the exception of the school department.
- Q. With the exception of the school department. So how many employees total are you responsible for throughout the entire city?
- 17 A. Approximately 2,300, give or take.
- 18 **Q**. Do you have a staff?
- 19 **A**. No.
- Q. Okay. How many of those employees are from the fire department?
  - Let me ask you a better question. Back in 2007, 2008, 2009, how many of those employees were employed by the fire department?
- 25 A. I don't know.

- Q. Does 435, give or take a few, sound about right?
- 2 A. It sounds reasonable.
  - Q. You'd agree that it's certainly more than 15?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Certainly more than 15 full time?
- **A**. Yes.

MR. MARTIN: I actually want to go a little out of order from what I was expecting to do. Your Honor, may I show the witness what has been premarked by the Defendant as Exhibit A?

THE COURT: Sure. As long as you identify the exhibit for the record, you're free to use --

MR. MARTIN: I think in this case it might be easier to bring it up because it's three pages.

THE COURT: The courtroom is yours, Mr. Martin. Whatever you'd like.

MR. MARTIN: So I'm bringing up Defendant's Exhibit A, the sexual harassment policy.

- **Q**. Could you just take a moment to look through that, please. Do you recognize this document?
- A. Yes.
- **Q**. Without telling us any of the contents within the document, can you tell us what it is.
- A. Sexual harassment policy.
- **Q**. For?

- A. City of Providence.
- Q. This is the current sexual harassment policy?
- 3 A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Is this in the same -- and who created this policy?
- 6 A. I don't know.
  - **Q**. Is this the policy that you go by during the course of your everyday work currently?
    - A. It's the policy -- yes.
      - **Q**. And is it in the same or substantially the same condition as it is when you hand it out or use it or stuff like that?
  - A. Yes.
    - MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as Exhibit 1.
    - THE COURT: Any objection?
      - MR. McHUGH: I thought it was Defendant's A already. I thought it was already entered full as Defendant's A.
      - THE COURT: There's been no evidence entered so far. Any evidence that's going to be admitted has to be admitted before the jury. So right now there is no evidence.
        - So you're moving Plaintiff's Exhibit 1?
- MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, I'm moving Defendant's

```
Exhibit A into evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.
 1
 2
                           Any objection?
              THE COURT:
 3
              MR. McHUGH:
                            No, your Honor.
              THE COURT: Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, which will be
 4
 5
      a duplicate of Defendant's Exhibit A, are both admitted
      without objection.
 6
 7
              (Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 and Defendant's Exhibit A
 8
       admitted in full.)
9
              MR. MARTIN:
                            May I have the ELMO, please.
10
            Ms. Oredugba, am I pronouncing that right?
      Q.
      Α.
            Yes.
11
12
            You would agree that this current sexual
       Q.
13
      harassment policy directs people to make their
14
      complaints in writing; correct?
15
      Α.
            Yes.
16
      Q.
            Directly to your office?
17
      Α.
            Yes.
18
            Can you see right down here where my finger is?
19
      Can you read that?
20
      Α.
            I can read the part that says 4/2013.
21
              THE COURT:
                          You can zoom in.
22
              MR. MARTIN:
                            Maybe.
23
      Q.
            Can you see those -- oops. Can you see the three
       letters before the 4 now?
24
25
      Α.
            Yes.
```

- Q. And what are the three letters?
- 2 A. It appears to be REV.
  - **Q**. So it says REV.4/2013?
    - A. Yes, I believe so.
    - **Q.** Does that mean that was revised in 2013?
- **A**. Yes.

- **Q.** Was this the policy that was current when Lori Franchina was an active employee for the Providence Fire Department?
- A. I don't know.
  - **Q**. I'm now going to show you what's been previously marked as Plaintiff's -- excuse me, the agreed-upon Exhibit Number 3.

THE COURT: Counsel, just so we're clear for our record keeping, any exhibit that you're offering will have a Plaintiff's number and any exhibit that the Defendants are offering will have a Defendant's letter.

So if they're jointly agreed to and you're offering it, it will be called Plaintiff's whatever the appropriate number is.

MR. MARTIN: I see. Thank you.

THE COURT: When you say that, I'll just know that the Defendants don't have an objection to it coming in, but you still have to move it in. Once it's identified by the witness, it still has to be moved in

before the jury to be a full exhibit.

MR. MARTIN: My problem was, I didn't tell the clerk that I only wanted the witness to see it. I'm sorry.

THE CLERK: It's only being shown to her.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Good.

THE COURT: Vickie's pretty good at that.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me just sort of explain so that you're not kept in the dark. How we do this, and it's got nothing -- we do this in every trial, is that before you can see a document, I have to admit it into evidence.

Before I admit it into evidence, it has to generically be identified by the witness, this is, you know, a sexual discrimination policy for the city.

They've exchanged documents between the sides, so the other party has a right to object to it coming into evidence.

That's why there will be times where the witness and I and the parties can see an exhibit but you won't yet. The only thing that you're to consider is evidence that I admit in full. It will be considered a full exhibit. When I say that, Vickie will hit a button, and then you'll be able to see it.

Until that point when it's just in the

identification stage, you won't see it. Nothing's being hidden from you. It's just a procedure we have to go through to make sure that only admissible evidence comes in.

In the world of electronics now, we're able to do that very conveniently where a button can just be pushed and the appropriate people can see it. And then when it's in full, the important people in the room, the 10 of you, will then be able to see it; but you only see it once it's been admitted in full.

Mr. Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

- Q. Have you had a chance to look at the document?
- A. Yes.

- **Q**. And without telling us the contents of the document, can you tell us what it is.
- A. Yes.
  - **Q**. Could you please do so.
- A. It is an informational form that's sent to individuals who have contacted me sometimes.
- **Q**. And you see down the bottom here it says that it was revised in May of 2007; correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - **Q**. Is this in the same or substantially the same condition as it was when it was used by your office in

```
May of 2007 and after?
 1
 2
      Α.
            Yes.
 3
              MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as --
       this is marked as Plaintiff's 3. We offer it as
 4
 5
       Plaintiff's 2.
              THE COURT: You can offer it as Plaintiff's 3.
 6
              MR. MARTIN: We offer it as Plaintiff's 3.
 7
 8
              THE COURT:
                         Any objection?
              MR. McHUGH: No objection.
9
10
              MR. MARTIN: I see the system now.
11
              THE CLERK:
                          In the book you have Exhibit
12
       Number 1, which is not the same as you admitted before.
13
              THE COURT:
                          We'll straighten that out during the
14
       break.
               Thanks.
              Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 is admitted as a full
15
16
       exhibit and can be shown to the jury.
17
              MR. MARTIN:
                           Thank you.
18
              (Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 admitted in full.)
19
      Q.
            Now, back in 2007, in the second paragraph, fire
20
       department and city employees were told that many
21
      workplace complaints could be resolved at an informal
22
       level; is that correct?
23
      Α.
            That's what it says in the document.
24
      Q.
            And they were instructed at times an employee
25
      wanting a specific behavior to stop, it goes on to say
```

- that they may attempt to speak directly with the individual whom they see as creating the problem; correct?
  - A. That's what it says, yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

- **Q**. And then they're told if that does not resolve the conflict, the employee should seek the assistance of their immediate supervisor; is that correct?
- A. Yes, that's what it says.
- **Q**. And then it's after that informal process then they would be required to make a complaint to you in writing; correct?
- MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form, the word "required."

THE COURT: Sustained.

- **Q**. Well, according to the document, if this informal approach does not work and the employee is experiencing on-the-job harassment or unlawful discrimination, they should file a complaint with you?
- A. It says they may.
- **Q**. They may.
- A. They have the option.
- Q. And then it goes on to say that EEO complaints must be in writing. Here.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So at least in 2007, employees were instructed to

- take their complaints to their immediate supervisor or the informal approach?
  - A. I don't know how they were instructed.
- **Q.** Well, through this form; right? Isn't that what it says?
  - A. This form -- that is what the form says.
  - **Q**. Did you train the immediate supervisors on how they should respond when an employee brings them an informal complaint of harassment or discrimination?
  - A. It depends on which immediate supervisors.
- 11 **Q**. Did you train any supervisors back in 2007, 2008, 2009?
- 13 A. Probably.

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. When you say probably, does that mean that you don't remember or you do remember training supervisors?
  - A. It means I remember training individuals, and I don't know offhand as I sit here who was trained.
  - **Q**. Do you know if the supervisors in the Providence Fire Department were trained in how to respond to informal complaints of sexual harassment or discrimination?
  - **A**. At any point in their history?
- Q. Fair enough. During the years 2007, 2008, 2009,
  do you know if any of their supervisors were trained in
  how to respond to an informal complaint from an

- employee of harassment or discrimination?
- 2 A. I don't know.

3

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. As the EEO officer, do you know who would know?
- 4 A. Not necessarily.
- Q. Is it -- let me move on. Now, you first
  interacted professionally with Lori Franchina in August
  of 2009: correct?
  - A. Yes, as far as I recall.
- 9 **Q**. And you'd received an e-mail from Chief Crawford regarding her?
  - A. I received -- I believe so. I met with Chief Crawford in 2009.
    - **Q**. Do you recall what Chief Crawford told you about Ms. Franchina at the time, why he was consulting with you?
    - A. I recall some of what he said, yes.
  - Q. Could you tell us what he said.
    - A. Well, I'm not certain whether this was 2009, but he said that there was some concern over placements, partnering and rescue.

To be clear, I met with Chief Crawford on various things; but he, I believe, said that

Ms. Franchina was concerned about people or I guess maybe her subordinates operating according to procedure or what she perceived procedure to be.

I recall him saying that she was a hard worker but that her personality was sometimes somewhat abrasive, and I recall him saying that he was seeking to make the working situation -- to improve the working situation for her and I guess all involved.

- **Q**. As the EEO officer at that time, did you have any authority to enforce rules and regulations of the Providence Fire Department that were not related to unlawful harassment or discrimination or retaliation?
- A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- **Q**. Did Chief Crawford tell you, then, why he chose to address those issues with you?
- A. Not that I recall.

THE CLERK: What number is it, please?

MR. MARTIN: This is Plaintiff's Exhibit

Number 1.

THE CLERK: Can't be.

MR. MARTIN: Number 35.

THE CLERK: If that's the next on your list.

Yes, I think it is. You gave me 34, so 35.

- **Q**. Let me show you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 35. Can you just take a minute to look at
- 23 that.
  - A. Yes.
- 25 **Q**. Thank you. This is an e-mail from Jeffrey

- Crawford to you? 1 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. On Tuesday, August 11th, 2009, at 3:33 p.m.? Α. 4 Yes. 5 Q. And you recall receiving and reading this e-mail? 6 Α. Not specifically. 7 Q. Well, you know that it was sent to you, though? 8 Α. I don't deny that it was sent. 9 Q. And it's in the same or substantially the same 10 condition as it was when you received it? 11 Α. Presumably. 12 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as 13 Plaintiff's 35. 14 MR. McHUGH: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Exhibit 35 will be admitted as a 15 16 full exhibit without objection. 17 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 35 admitted in full.) 18 THE COURT: Mr. Martin, you might want to zoom 19 in a little bit. I'm finding it hard to read. 20 Is that better? MR. MARTIN: 21 Q. So the message started that he had just had a 22 meeting with Lori Franchina; is that correct? 23 Α. Yes. 24
  - **Q**. Was this the first time you'd ever heard of Lori Franchina making any type of complaint?

- A. I don't -- I'm not certain.
- Q. And he said that it was following one run in
- 3 particular in which she believed that she was exposed
- 4 to blood and bodily fluid?
- 5 A. Yes.

- 6 Q. It goes on to say that it turned out that the
- 7 exposure was not significant; however, the manner of
- 8 exposure has been the last straw of a series of hostile
- 9 work experiences. Do you see that?
- 10 A. That's what it says here.
- 11 Q. Okay. Did the term "hostile work environment"
- have any particular meaning for you as the EEO officer?
- 13 **A**. Did it?
- 14 **Q**. Yes.
- 15 A. I don't specifically recall reading this e-mail as
- 16 such.
- 17 Q. But do you recall the meeting with him?
- 18 **A**. Yes.
- 19  $\mathbf{Q}$ . Okay. Did he explain to you what the manner of
- 20 exposure was that the e-mail claims was the last straw
- of a series of hostile work experiences?
- 22 A. I believe so.
- 23 Q. And what was the manner of exposure?
- A. Well, I believe it is alleged to have been someone
- 25 taking off their glove; and in taking off their glove,

- bodily fluids, it's my understanding, were spreadabout.
- Q. Now, when you get a complaint from someone
   regarding an allegation or a concern of sexual
   harassment, you have a few different options, don't
   you?
- **A.** Yes.

- **Q**. You could tell them, Hey, this doesn't sound like an EEO issue; right?
- 10 A. I could.
- **Q**. Or you could investigate further?
- **A.** Yes.
  - **Q**. And before -- I mean, with 2,300 employees, before you decide to investigate further, you would have to conclude that the allegation at least had some merit; correct?

Maybe "merit" is a bad word. I'm sorry. Some indication that it would involve a topic that falls under the category of, or under the jurisdiction of the EEO officer; correct?

- A. Not necessarily.
- **Q**. No? So there would be circumstances in which you investigate claims that are not related to harassment or discrimination or retaliation?
- 25 A. Correct.

- **Q**. And why is that?
- A. Because my manager has instructed me to also cover
- 3 employee disputes, general human resources, employee
- 4 relations matters that don't necessarily fall under
- 5 EE0.

- 6 Q. So you're taking care of all of the EEO
- 7 complaints, general disputes, general human resources
- 8 with no staff under you?
- 9 A. I'm taking care of all of the EEO complaints.
- 10 share responsibility for general disputes and employee
- 11 relations matters.
- $\mathbf{Q}$ . And when you talk about general disputes and
- general human relations matters, is that also 2,300
- employees, the same 2,300, or are there some additional
- 15 employees?
- 16 A. There would be additional employees.
- 17 **Q**. How many additional employees are there?
- 18 A. It could be up to an additional 2,000.
- 19  $\mathbf{Q}$ . So 2,300 for EEO, 4,300 for employee disputes and
- 20 general human resources functions?
- 21 A. Approximately, yes.
- 22 **Q**. And you said you share that responsibility. Who
- 23 do you share that responsibility with?
- 24 A. With other managers in the Human Resources
- 25 Department.

- Q. And how many managers were sharing those responsibilities in the years 2007, 2008, 2009?
- A. It has -- well, so in 2007 -- 2007, I would saythere were three; 2008, three; 2009, three.
- 5 **Q**. Okay.
- 6 A. Including myself.
- Q. If I ever cut you off, just let me know. I'm sorry. So when dealing just with your EEO function, when you -- you didn't have authority to discipline firefighters, you could only make recommendations;
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
- Q. And in conducting your investigations, you rely heavily on the chiefs of the department; correct?
- 15  $\mathbf{A}$ . At times.
- 16 **Q**. Because they have one-on-one, direct contact with the people at play?
- 18 A. To the best of my knowledge.
- Q. And they know the policies and the procedures and the kind of specifics of the fire department?
- 21 A. Presumably.
- 22 **Q**. And because your -- you were pretty busy?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. You couldn't conduct all of the EEO investigations for the entire city all by yourself?

MR. McHUGH: Well, I'm going to object. Lack of foundation.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. Not to the extent that I would want. Not as completely as I ideally would want.
- **Q**. And in this case you were relying on some information from Chief Crawford: correct?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. And other chiefs would provide additional information as well from time to time?
- A. In this matter or in general?
- 12 **Q**. Thank you. I'm sorry. That wasn't very clear.

  13 Let me ask you a better question.

In this first encounter with Lori Franchina in August of 2009, you spoke with Chief Crawford and some other chiefs in order to gather information?

- A. In August 2009, I know I spoke with Chief
  Crawford. I don't know if I spoke with other chiefs in
  August of 2009.
- Q. Did Lori cancel appointments with you?
- 21 A. I believe so.
- Q. You believe so or do you remember her canceling appointments?
- A. I recall at some point. I don't know that it was August 2009.

- Q. Okay. So do you recall if she canceled two appointments in August, September, October of 2009?
- A. I don't recall.

- **Q**. Huh. Do you keep any type of datebook or anything where somebody could learn that she canceled or failed to show to two appointments at that time?
- A. Not as strictly as that. I do try to make note.
- **Q**. And do you prepare a report in connection with your investigation? Maybe "report" is the wrong word.

You filled out a form called Complaint Form, then underneath Complaint Form, EEO/AA Complaint Number 2009-026; correct?

- A. I did not prepare a report with respect to this matter. I believe that I did fill out my standard complaint form.
- Q. I'm going to show you what's marked as Plaintiff's 15. It's EEO/AA Complaint 2009-026. Actually, I'm going to bring it to you because it's multiple pages.

Ms. Oredugba, having had a chance to review these four pages, is this complaint in the same or substantially the same condition as it was when you filled it out?

A. Yes, to the best of my knowledge.

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.

MR. McHUGH: No objection, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Plaintiff's Exhibit 15 is admitted 3 as a full exhibit. (Plaintiff's Exhibit 15 admitted in full.) 4 5 Now, up here where it says "Crawford (EMS Q. 6 Division), " Chief Crawford was the chief of the EMS Division: correct? 7 8 Α. Yes. Q. Lori Franchina worked for the EMS Division? 9 10 Α. Yes. 11 Q. He was her immediate supervisor? 12 I know he was her supervisor. I'm not certain he 13 was her immediate. And according to the complaint information form we 14 Q. 15 looked at earlier revised in May of 2007, it was 16 appropriate for Lori to bring her informal complaint to 17 Chief Crawford? 18 Α. Certainly. 19 And underneath his name are some bullet points of Q. 20 things that you learned from Chief Crawford? 21 Α. I don't see bullet points, but --22 Q. Fair enough. There is a list of things that you 23 had learned from Chief Crawford that do not have bullet 24 points?

25

Α.

Correct.

- Q. Thank you. One of them is that she's on her game and she knows her stuff and that the chief gets compliments. Did he say who he gets compliments from?
- A. I don't recall.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Was it patients or family members of patients?
- A. I don't recall. It could be. I don't know.
  - **Q**. Was it her co-workers?
  - MR. McHUGH: Objection. Asked and answered three times.
- THE COURT: Overruled.
  - **Q**. Was it her co-workers who were giving compliments about her?
- A. I don't know.
  - **Q.** Did you ever see any type of -- as of this point in August of 2009, any type of written complaint about Lori Franchina's performance of her duties?
  - MR. McHUGH: Objection. Lack of foundation.

    THE COURT: Overruled.
- **A**. Not that I recall.
- **Q**. Moving down, it says "difficulty filling spots on resdue." Do you know what that means?
  - A. I believe that "resdue" is a typo and it should say "rescue."
- Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. So that makes more sense.

  Sometimes I don't know if it's, like, acronyms.

So the difficulty filling spots on rescues.

After two years on the job, Lori is getting rescue
lieutenant's pay. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

- **Q**. And then he said, Some people view it that you aren't a real lieutenant, you just walked in and they handed it to you. Did you follow up on that at all?
- A. Can you clarify?
- Q. Sure. Did you ask him who felt that way?
- A. I don't recall.
- **Q**. Did you know how much more rescue lieutenants were earning than people under the rescue lieutenant?
- A. Did I know at that time, I don't -- I don't recall.
- MR. MARTIN: I'm going to pull it up in just a second.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you will have all of the admitted exhibits in the jury room with you during your deliberations. Sometimes they fly on and off the ELMO screen, but you will have all of these back with you. Anything that's admitted full will be back with you when you deliberate.

**Q**. On the next page of Exhibit 15 is more information that you discovered during your investigation; is that correct?

- A. It may still be part of what Chief Crawford wastelling me.
  - Q. So here it says, "One of the engine guys was doing chest compressions. He had too much blood on his gloves. She tells him to change the gloves. In doing so, he snapped the gloves and the blood snapped on her forehead." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- **Q**. Did you ever interview the person who snapped the gloves?
- 11 A. I believe so.
- 12 **Q**. What did he tell you?
  - A. I don't fully -- I don't recall verbatim, but what I recall is that he -- that things were moving quickly and in taking off his gloves, he did not do anything intentional other than taking off his gloves.
    - **Q.** Huh. Did you ask him about the normal protocol for removing prophylactic -- soiled prophylactic gloves in an emergency rescue vehicle?
  - A. I don't recall. I may not have.
- Q. Okay. Did you take him at his word that it wasn't intentional?
- 23 A. You're asking if I believed him?
- 24 **Q**. Yeah.
- 25 A. Yes.

- **Q**. Wouldn't it be helpful to know what the normal protocol is in removing those soiled gloves before you determine whether or not he was telling the truth?
- A. Probably.

Q. So if I were to tell you that the normal protocol is that you put your hand into the trash receptacle and then remove the first glove and then you take your bare hand and remove the second glove so that the first one snaps up into it so that any snappage, for lack of a better term, goes into the receptacle, if I were to tell you that that were the proper protocol, would you still find it credible if someone were to say that they could accidentally snap blood and brain matter on another person's forehead?

MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form. Lack of foundation, speculation.

THE COURT: Assuming that you're asking that and that there will be evidence introduced at some point during the trial of that, assuming that, the objection's overruled. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

- A. I'm --
- **Q**. I'll ask you again if you want. Be happy to. So what we're talking about, as an investigator, somebody tells you something and you want to figure out if

- they're telling the truth; right?
- **A**. Uh-huh.

- Q. Yes, ma'am?
- 4 A. Go ahead.
  - **Q**. And one of the things you would do is figure out what the normal protocol and training is; correct?
  - A. Ideally.
  - **Q**. And then if the person has violated the normal protocol or training, maybe that's some indication as to whether or not they've told you something truthful about their intent; right?
  - A. It could be.
    - Q. So let me tell you this. If you were to learn that the proper protocol for removing soiled prophylactic gloves is to place your hand into the receptacle, remove the first glove and then remove the second glove so that it snaps over it and there's no soiled glove exposed and that all the debris lands in the receptacle, would you still find it credible if someone were to say that they accidentally snapped blood and brain matter all over someone else's face?
      - MR. McHUGH: Same objection, your Honor.
      - THE COURT: Overruled.
  - A. Yes, I could.
- 25 Q. I'm going to switch to the next page. Now, here's

1 a series of what looks like questions and answers; 2 correct?

A. Yes.

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And the questions are from you, the EEO officer?
- 5 A. I believe so.
- 6 **Q**. And the answers are from Chief Crawford?
- 7 A. Yes, I believe so.
  - Q. Okay. You asked, "Are they treating her differently because she's a woman and they don't like taking orders or being belittled by her?" Right?
  - A. That's what it says.
  - **Q**. So you must have gotten some information --

MR. McHUGH: I'm going to object. He left out the rest of that question. The whole question should be read.

- Q. "Are they treating her differently because she's a woman and they don't like taking orders or being belittled by her? Would they take it better from a man?" Did I read the entire question?
- A. Yes.
- **Q**. So going back to the first part of the question where it says, "Are they treating her differently because she's a woman and they don't like taking orders," was that something that you were suspicious of during your interview with him?

1 MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form. Use of the 2 word "suspicious." 3 THE COURT: Overruled. 4 Α. No, I wasn't suspicious. 5 Q. Why did you ask it? 6 Α. Because she's female and he came to see me. So 7 either he said and/or I presumed that that was the EEO 8 basis on what she was discussing with me. 9 Q. Was Lori Franchina the only rescue lieutenant you 10 knew of who was having a problem with male subordinates 11 not following her orders? 12 Α. When? 2006, 7, 8, 9. 13 Q. 14 MR. McHUGH: Well, objection. That's four 15 years' questions, years in one question. 16 THE COURT: Can you answer that collectively or 17 do you need it broken down, ma'am? 18 THE WITNESS: I can answer collectively. 19 THE COURT: Overruled. 20 Α. Lieutenant -- in terms of rank, I don't know. 21 Fair point. Thank you. Maybe I was too specific Q. 22 with lieutenant. Were you aware of any other female

superior officers besides Lori Franchina who had a

problem with male subordinates not following their

23

24

25

orders?

A. No.

MR. MARTIN: It looks like you think there's a problem with my question.

MR. McHUGH: Well, objection. Commenting on -THE COURT: Sustained.

- **Q**. Were you aware of any females who were having problems with males not following their orders besides Lori?
- A. With males not following their orders? Yes.
- **Q**. Moving down, it says, "She's openly gay, believes they cut her less slack because if the guys think they have a chance, they cut slack; but if they don't, no slack." Did I read that correctly?
- A. Yes.
- **Q**. When it says "if they think they have a chance," what did you understand him to be telling you?
- **A**. Chance to date.
- **Q**. Date?
  - **A**. (Nods affirmatively.)
    - **Q**. Does that mean that the women they had a chance to date were cut more slack than women that they did not have a chance to date?
  - A. No.
    - **Q**. What did it mean to you at the time?
- **A.** What it meant to me at the time was that she

believed that if -- that she -- I don't like to use the word "slack" but was cut less slack, so to speak, because she believed that if the males in the department had the perception that a female -- there was any potential in dating a female, that she believed that they would cut those females less slack -- I mean more slack, so to speak; and if they believed that there wasn't a chance to date them, then she believed that they would cut such a female less slack.

- **Q**. But you're saying she believed, but this is a summary of your investigation with Chief Crawford.
- A. Right. I believe he was relaying her belief to me.
- Q. But it doesn't say "she believes." It says, "She's openly gay," and then it goes on to say, "Believes they cut her less slack because if they think they have a chance, they cut slack." It doesn't say that Lori Franchina told that to Chief Crawford; right?
- A. No, it says just what you read, but. . .
- **Q**. And then it goes on, and there's a list of female names there. And, I'm sorry, the hole punch blocks a couple out. Did you interview all of those females?
- A. Not all of them.
- **Q**. Did you interview some of them?
- 25 A. I believe so.

- Q. Earlier when I asked you about females having problems with males in the department, I thought I saw you hesitate. Was there something else that you were going to say? MR. McHUGH: Well, I'm going to object. He's characterizing the witness's --THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. McHugh. Hold on, Mr. Martin. Go ahead. MR. McHUGH: I'm going to object again. keeps characterizing the witness's testimony, the witness's movements, demeanors. It's improper. THE COURT: Mr. Martin, have you called this witness as an adverse witness? MR. MARTIN: Yes, your Honor, Federal Rule 611. THE COURT: Under 611?
  - MR. MARTIN: Yes.
  - THE COURT: Objection's overruled.
- **Q.** I thought you hesitated for just a moment when I'd asked you about females and males' problems with orders and whatnot. Was I wrong?
- A. I don't think so. I don't think you were wrong.
- **Q**. Do you think that you did hesitate?
  - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q. Could you tell us why you hesitated when I asked you about that.

- Α. Because of the -- because of how specific your question was.
  - Q. Huh. How would you ask the question? MR. McHUGH: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q. So let me ask you, did you have any information from your investigation about males and women having problems together, working together at the Providence Fire Department?
- Α. When?
- When you were conducting this investigation that's Q. 12 listed in the complaint.
- 13 Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

- 14 Q. And what was the information that you discovered?
  - Well, the reason I hesitated is in every Α. department there are people who have problems working together, whether they're male or female. I'm not trying to be difficult, but --
  - Q. No. That's fine. Did you have any other females who made complaints of sexual harassment,
- 21 discrimination or retaliation during the years 2006,
- 22 2007, 2008 or 2009?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 Did you make -- did you recommend corrective Q. 25 action at the end of any of those other investigations?

A. Possibly.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. You don't want to tell us who the other females are; is that correct?
  - MR. McHUGH: Objection, your Honor.
  - THE COURT: Overruled.
    - A. I try to keep confidences to the extent possible.
    - **Q**. Is your concern about keeping confidences related to your concern that they could be retaliated against?
      - A. My predominant concern with all matters with any department is the privacy of the individual who comes to meet with me.
      - **Q**. Do you have a concern at the Providence Fire

        Department that women who make complaints to you about harassment or discrimination or retaliation will be retaliated against?
    - A. Not a specific concern.
  - Q. Not a specific concern. What about a general concern?
    - **A**. With respect to the fire department?
- 20 **Q**. Yes.

right?

- 21 A. No.
- 22 **Q**. I'm approaching with Exhibit Number 16.
- 23 Ms. Oredugba, you've just reviewed Plaintiff's 16,
- which is Complaint Form EEO Number 2009-038; is that
- 25

A. Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. This is another complaint form that you wrote in regards to Lori Franchina?
  - A. Yes.
  - **Q**. This is in the same or substantially the same condition as it was when you created it?
  - A. It appears so.
  - MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as Exhibit 16.
  - MR. McHUGH: I object to pages 1 through 6 of Exhibit 16 only, and the reason is they're the same as pages 1 through 6 of Exhibit 15. So it's cumulative and duplicative.
  - THE COURT: Objection's overruled. The exhibit will be admitted as a full exhibit.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 16 admitted in full.)

- **Q**. So, Ms. Oredugba, the first six pages are the same as the last report; correct?
- A. Yes.
- **Q**. And what you did was you just copied and pasted that so that this would be comprehensive?
- A. I copied and pasted it.
- Q. And then after the six pages is when you started adding the new information related to this new complaint?

**A**. Yes.

- **Q**. So I'm going to start with showing you the new pages and not the old pages.
- A. Okay.
- Q. Now, on page 7 towards the bottom it says, "Have you brought these events to anyone else's attention? If so, please state who and when the events were brought to their attention." Do you see that?
- A. Yes.
- **Q**. Did you get an answer to who else she told about the events that she was complaining about?

Actually, let me start back and make it a little bit better. That was a question that you posed to Lori Franchina?

- A. No, that's just part of the standard form.

  There's a standard complaint form that, if things were done properly and perfectly, is answered by the complainant.
- **Q**. Okay.
- A. I put my own notes into a complaint form.
- Q. Okay. Did you at all during this complaint, your creation of this complaint form, did you speak with Lori Franchina?
  - A. I'd have to actually see other pages of the complaint form again. I don't know that this form has

- 1 my -- I don't believe so. I don't believe that this
  2 form has notes. I'm not sure. I'm sorry.
  - Q. If you want to look, I'm happy to show you.
- 4 A. Okay. So this does have notes.
- 5 Q. This has notes taken from a conversation with Lori
- 6 Franchina?

- 7 **A**. Yes.
- Q. And when you spoke with Lori Franchina, did you
  ask her if she brought these events to anyone else's
  attention?
- 11 A. I don't believe or I don't recall whether I asked 12 her that specifically.
- Q. And then in number -- underneath number 11, you wrote, "Meeting with Chief Farrell September 4th, '09, in EEO office." Did I read that correctly?
- 16 **A.** Yes.
- 17 **Q**. Was Lori Franchina present at that meeting?
- 18 A. No, I don't believe so.
- Q. And there are different levels of chiefs at the Providence Fire Department or at least there were in 2007 -- 2009 when you were doing this work; correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. And what rank was this chief?
- A. At that time I believe he was chief of the department, meaning head of the department.

Q. What did you learn from Chief Farrell about the 2 Lori Franchina investigation that you were conducting? 3 I'd have to refer to my notes. 4 THE COURT: Move the document up, Mr. Martin. It can't be seen on the screen. 5 6 Q. So these notes here are what you learned from Chief Farrell? 7 8 I don't know whether it's what I learned, but it's 9 what I wrote when speaking with Chief Farrell. 10 Q. So now it says -- in the part of your notes 11 underneath where it references your meeting with Chief 12 Farrell, there's reference to Andre Ferro; correct? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. What did he tell you about Andre Ferro? 15 Α. I don't recall. 16 Now, in 2009, in your meeting on September 4th, Q. 17 2009, you were investigating incidents that had occurred in August and July of 2009; correct? 18 19 Α. Presumably. 20

Q. And while you were investigating those incidents in 2009, Chief Farrell informed you about what had

happened in 2006; correct?

Α. I can't say that.

1

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Your notes don't indicate that he had told you about the situation between Lori Franchina and Andre

Ferro? 1 2 Objection. The document speaks for MR. McHUGH: 3 itself. THE COURT: Overruled. 4 5 As I look, I don't know what relation this has. Α. 6 At times, if I have several matters in one department 7 and I have a person there, I may address various 8 matters. So this doesn't spark a memory in terms of 9 all that we discussed, so I can only go by what I 10 wrote. 11 Q. Well, you didn't work in the department in -- you 12 weren't the EEO officer in 2006; right? I believe I became the EEO officer sometime in 13 Α. 14 2006. 15 You became the EEO officer in 2006? Q. 16 Α. I believe so. 17 Were you the EEO officer when Andre Ferro was 18 brought up on charges for his conduct versus Lori 19 Franchina? 20 Α. If I was, I was not involved. 21 Q. You weren't involved? 22 Α. (Nods affirmatively.) 23 Q. Moving on to the next page, in bold you wrote 24 here, "There's an issue of female lieutenants not being 25 respected."

- A. No, I didn't write "there's an issue." It says,"Issue of female lieutenants not being respected."
  - **Q**. Okay. And then underneath it, it says, "Tell them to approach the officer you're coming on the run. I expect your cooperation. If response from that officer is that they're not doing it, then they should contact the chief officer." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. What is that supposed to represent?
- A. I believe it's what Chief Farrell was telling me that he either did tell his other officers to tell their subordinates or that he was going to tell his other officers to tell their subordinates throughout the department, the engine companies.
- **Q**. Certainly. So what Chief Farrell's approach was was for the female lieutenants to tell all the other officers on the scene, I expect your cooperation, and that if they didn't get it, they were supposed to call the chief?
- A. I believe his approach was that all officers, female or male, were to tell their subordinates, You're going to do XYZ, and if their orders weren't followed, that all officers, male or female, should immediately contact whoever the chief officer is.
- Q. Well, isn't what happened that Chief Farrell

1 thought of the idea to tell the female lieutenants to 2 do that and then you were afraid that that would 3 isolate them or single them out so you asked Chief Farrell to order all of the lieutenants to do that? 4 5 I don't recall that. Α. Okay. And here there's reference to Lori 6 Q. 7 Franchina filing a Temporary Restraining Order in 8 Superior Court against a co-worker? Yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. Was this the first time you'd become aware of that 11 incident when you wrote this note? 12 Α. I believe so. 13 Q. On the next page you wrote in italics, "I asked 14 whether they were in the process of disciplining 15 McCaffrey." The part in italics represents your words 16 to them during this meeting? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. Chief Morgan, who is Chief Morgan? 19 At the time he -- I believe he was the Α. 20 investigative officer for the fire department. 21 one of the chiefs in the fire department, and I believe 22 he was the investigative officer. 23 Q. Okay. And Chief Morgan told you that they were

bringing the matter to you at HR for you to handle it

because they believed it was likely to result in

24

1 litigation?

- A. That's what I noted.
- Q. Did he tell you what type of litigation they thought this was going to result in?
  - **A**. No.

2

5

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Did they tell you that they thought it was going to be a sexual harassment lawsuit?
  - A. I don't believe so.
- 9 **Q**. Did they tell you they thought it was going to be a discrimination lawsuit?
- 11 A. I don't believe he said anything more than that.
- 12 **Q**. So he basically just said litigation, HR, need your help?
  - A. I mean, I don't believe -- I don't recall having any discussion about litigation other than that.
    - **Q**. Well, as the EEO officer who is investigating Lori Franchina's complaints, weren't you curious as to what type of litigation they were afraid of?
    - A. I think more than -- I think my issue was that I didn't believe it to be procedure to send public safety matters to HR to administer it. So I think that was more my predominant concern.
    - Q. My question was, as the EEO officer investigating
      Lori Franchina's complaints of harassment and
      discrimination, weren't you curious as to what type of

litigation her chiefs were afraid of? 1 2 MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form. Asked and 3 answered, use of the word "afraid," lack of foundation. THE COURT: 4 Overruled. I was likely curious, but I don't know that I 5 Α. 6 would -- Chief Morgan is probably not where I would go 7 to get my information. I could get the information 8 from the Law Department if it's there. 9 Q. Well, my question's a little bit different than My question is, if her superior officers are 10 11 afraid that she's going to sue the city for harassment 12 or discrimination or retaliation, wouldn't that 13 knowledge be important to you for your investigation so 14 that you could follow up on that? 15 If they were afraid, it would be good for me to Α. 16 know. 17 Q. So when they tell you that they're afraid of 18 litigation, wouldn't it also be good for you to say, 19 What type of litigation are you talking about? 20 Α. He didn't tell me they were afraid of litigation. 21 Okay. Well, maybe "afraid" is the wrong word. Q. 22 When he told you they brought the matter down to HR to 23 let you handle it because they believed it is likely to 24 result in litigation, wouldn't it have been helpful for 25 you to say, What type of litigation?

1 A. It might have been helpful.

Q. Then you went on to write, "He feels this has a relationship to her being harassed or people not cooperating with her. Doesn't know if it's because of her sexual orientation. If it is, then it's information that we need to have." Did I read that

A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

17

18

correctly?

- **Q**. Now, "He feels this has a relationship to her being harassed," that's from Chief Morgan?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 **Q**. "Doesn't know if it's because of her sexual orientation," comma. That's from Chief Morgan?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 **Q**. "If it is, then it's information that we need to have." Is that from Chief Morgan or is that from you?
  - A. I believe Chief Morgan.
  - **Q**. Chief Morgan wanted that information?
- 19 A. I believe so.
- Q. Do you know who Chief Morgan wanted to find that information?
- 22 A. I don't understand.
- Q. Was he bringing this to you so that you would conduct an investigation in order to see whether or not any of these events were related to her sexual

orientation?

- A. I'm not certain. I think his position is that if there is something that was found, that it was important, that he felt it would be incumbent upon him to take measures so that it wasn't repeated. That's my understanding.
- **Q**. It would certainly be consistent with your position as the EEO officer for someone to bring that type of investigation to you to conduct?
- A. It would.

THE COURT: Mr. Martin, would this be a good time to break for lunch?

MR. MARTIN: Great time.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to break for lunch. Continue not to discuss this case amongst yourselves or with anyone else, and we'll see you back in an hour.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Ms. Oredugba, you can come up. You understand you're still under oath?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you all have a good lunch, ladies and gentlemen? At some point if you're looking for food suggestions, I'll tell you; but Thursdays, just for planning sake, we have a lot of food trunks

out on Kennedy Plaza.

It's always a good day if you're going to buy lunch some day. There's usually three or four different ones out there. If you want my personal recommendations at some point, I'll be glad to pass them on. They're during the week, too, but it's usually one or two. Thursdays is when there's the most.

Mr. Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

- Q. Ms. Oredugba, when we left off, we finished talking about the EEO Complaint Form Number 038.

  During this fall and winter of 2009, you became aware of an incident that occurred between Lori Franchina and Firefighter Sean McGarty at the Firefighters' Hall?
- A. Yes.
- **Q**. And do you recall how you became aware of that incident?
- A. I don't recall how I first became aware, no.
- MR. MARTIN: May I show the witness Exhibit
  Number 10.
- 22 Q. This is an e-mail. Can you see it?
- **A**. Not yet.
  - **Q**. Can you see that?
- **A**. Yes.

Q. 1 Please take a moment to read it, and let me know 2 when you're done. 3 Α. Yes. Q. You've had a chance to read that? 4 5 Α. Yes. 6 Q. This is an e-mail from Michael Morgan to you? Α. Yes. 7 8 Q. Dated December 14th, 2009? Α. 9 Yes. 10 And this is in the same or substantially the same Q. condition as when you read it? 11 12 To the best of my knowledge. Your Honor, we offer this as 13 MR. MARTIN: 14 Exhibit Number 10. 15 Objection for the reasons I argued MR. McHUGH: 16 yesterday afternoon. If need be, I can restate them, 17 your Honor. 18 THE COURT: No need to restate them. Thanks, 19 Mr. McHugh. 20 The objection's overruled. Exhibit 10 is 21 admitted as a full exhibit. 22 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 10 admitted in full.) 23 Q. Was this the first communication that you received 24 regarding the incident at the Firefighters' Hall?

I'm not certain.

25

Α.

- Q. Now, did you investigate this incident after you received this e-mail?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. You read Form 17s that were filled out by firefighters?
- 6 A. I believe so.
- Q. And you read a Form 17 that was filled out by Lori 8 Franchina?
- 9 A. Presumably.
- Q. And this incident is also referred to in your complaint form that we were referring to earlier,
- 12 Complaint Number 038; correct?
- 13 A. Yes, I believe so.
- 14 **Q**. I'm just going to flip back to that for one second if you don't mind.
- 16 **A**. Okay.
- Q. I'm putting in front of you page number 8 from
  Exhibit Number 16. That's the EEO Complaint 038. Down
  here at the bottom, I'll zoom in for you, this is the
  reference in the report to the Firefighters' Hall
  incident: correct?
- 22 A. I believe so.
- Q. And it says here that Lieutenant Franchina was off duty?
- 25 A. That's what it says.

- 1 Q. And the other guys were on duty?
- $2 \mid A$ . That is what it says.

6

13

14

15

16

- Q. And Chief Morgan mentioned to you that they
  shouldn't have been there on duty, but the firefighters
  claimed that they had permission?
  - A. That's what the form says here.
- Q. So if someone were to say that none of the firefighters were on duty, that would be inconsistent with what was reported to you during your investigation?
- 11 A. That would be inconsistent with what is written here, yes.
  - Q. Turning back to the December 14th e-mail, which is Exhibit Number 10, did you speak directly to -- it lists some firefighters involved. One is Elliot Murphy. Did you speak to Elliot Murphy directly?
- 17 **A**. I don't recall.
- 18 **Q**. Did you speak to Sean McGarty directly?
- 19 A. I don't recall.
- Q. If we don't have notes from any type of interview
  like that, would it be safe to assume that you did not
  speak to them?
  - A. I try not to assume, but --
- Q. Fair enough. Do you typically keep notes when you conduct interviews for incidents like this?

1 A. Yes.

- **Q.** And you don't have any notes from these interviews or, excuse me, let me ask a better question. You don't have any notes from any interviews regarding this incident with Elliot Murphy or Sean McGarty?
- A. I don't believe I do.
- Q. Now, it says down here that Lieutenant Murphy filed a man annoyed report on December 11th, '09, with the Providence Police for documentation of an altercation. Did you review the report that Lieutenant Murphy filed with the Providence Police?
- A. I don't recall.
  - Q. It also goes on to say that Murphy states he was struck in the upper arm by Franchina as she exited in his statement to the police. Did you ever see anything in which Lieutenant Murphy claimed that he had been struck by Lieutenant Franchina?
  - A. I don't recall.
  - **Q**. It goes on to say, "Murphy also filed an injury report due to the alleged assault by Franchina." Did you read the injury report that was filed by Lieutenant Murphy?
- A. I don't recall.
- **Q**. Do you know what type of injuries Lieutenant

  Murphy claimed that Lieutenant Franchina had caused

him? 1 2 Α. No. I don't. 3 Q. It was reported to you during your investigation 4 that Lieutenant Franchina had asked Lieutenant Murphy 5 to help her? Α. 6 Correct. 7 Q. That she believed she was being threatened by 8 Firefighter McGarty? 9 Α. Are you asking if that was reported to me? Yes. 10 Q. 11 Well, let's see. It says, "Fire Lieutenant Murphy 12 was asked to intervene in the confrontation by Lieutenant Franchina." 13 14 Q. And at the conclusion of this, your investigation 15 of this incident, you did make recommendations for 16 corrective action, didn't you? 17 I don't recall making recommendations -- an 18 official recommendation. 19 Well, you learned that the department was planning Q. 20 on bringing charges against Firefighter McGarty; 21 correct? 22 Α. Correct. 23 Q. And then you recommended that they should also 24 file charges against Lieutenant Murphy; correct?

I don't recall.

25

Α.

1 MR. MARTIN: Can I show Exhibit Number 11 to the witness. 2 3 Q. Can you see that okay? Α. 4 Yes. 5 Q. Let me know when you're finished reading it. 6 Α. I finished. 7 Q. This is an e-mail from you to you? 8 Α. Yes, but in looking at it, it looks like -- I 9 don't know that it was actually sent; but yes, it is a 10 note from me to my note file. 11 Q. And this is a document that you retrieved from 12 your files? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. And it's in the same or substantially the same 15 condition as it was when you wrote it? 16 Α. It appears so. MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as 17 18 Exhibit 11. 19 MR. McHUGH: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Exhibit 11 is admitted as a full 20 21 exhibit without objection. 22 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 11 admitted in full.) So on December 22nd, 2009, you took note that 23 Q. Chief Warren -- who is Chief Warren? 24

Chief Warren I believe was the -- he was one of

25

Α.

- the chiefs in the department. I don't recall whether
  he was deputy -- I don't -- I don't recall which
  position he held, but he was one of the front office
  chiefs.
  - **Q**. And Chief Warren advised you that they were preparing charges against Firefighter McGarty?
  - A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. For the incident that occurred at the union hall?
- A. Presumably.
- 10 **Q**. And also against the lieutenant who refused to assist Lieutenant Franchina?
- 12 A. That's what it says.
  - Q. Wasn't it your recommendation that the lieutenant who refused to assist Lieutenant Franchina also be disciplined?
    - A. My recommendation would be for them to proceed with carrying out their procedures. So when I spoke with Chief Morgan and there was discussion of sending it to HR, HR would not carry out the administrative procedures of the fire or police department. It would be for the fire or police to carry out their own administrative procedures.
    - **Q**. And after this e-mail, it was your belief that that procedure was followed through with?
  - A. It was my belief that the procedure -- that the

1 procedure was followed through.

- Q. You believed that charges had been brought against
- 3 Firefighter McGarty?
- 4 **A**. Yes.
- 5 **Q**. And a hearing held?
- A. I believe that they followed through with whateveris the procedure once charges are brought.
- Q. And you believe that Firefighter McGarty was disciplined?
- A. It was my belief that it was followed through,

  charges brought and everything that follows pursuant to

  fire department procedures, yes.
- 13 Q. And the same for Lieutenant Murphy?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And then over the course of the next few months,

  January, February and March, you heard from Lieutenant

  Franchina additional times; correct?
- 18 A. I believe so.
- 19 **Q**. On the phone?
- 20 A. I believe so.
- 21 Q. She would contact you directly?
- 22 A. By directly, you mean on the phone?
- 23 Q. Directly to you, yes, on the phone.
- 24 A. I believe so.
- 25 **Q**. As you advised her to do?

- 1 A. I'm not sure if I advised her or not, but I try to make myself accessible.
  - **Q**. Did you fill out any -- do you remember what she said to you during those times that she called you in January, February and March of 2010?
  - A. Not specifically, no.
- Q. Did you take any notes or fill out any complaint forms to keep track of what she said to you?
  - A. Presumably. Possibly.
- 10 **Q**. Possibly? Do you recall if she was making complaints to you?
- 12 A. Possibly.

3

4

5

6

9

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Do you recall what type of complaints she was making to you?
- 15 A. Not specifically.

(Counsel hands document to witness.)

- 17 **Q**. Please.
  - A. I do recall her saying that she had filed a restraining order in Superior Court against someone else in the fire department.
    - **Q**. Do you recall in January, February or March of 2010 if she reported to you any improvement in her situation regarding how she was being treated at work?
- 24 A. I don't recall.
- MR. MARTIN: Can I show the witness Exhibit 12.

- 1 Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as Plaintiff's
- 12. If you can please take a look and let me know whenyou're finished reading it.
  - A. Yes. I finished.
- 5 Q. This is an e-mail from you to Sybil Bailey?
- 6 A. Correct.

4

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 7 Q. Could you tell us who Sybil Bailey is, please.
- A. She's the Director of Human Resources for the Cityof Providence.
- 10 **Q**. And you wrote this e-mail to her on May 26th, 11 2010?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. This is in the same or substantially the same condition as it was when you wrote it?
- 15 A. It appears so.
  - MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this into evidence as Exhibit 12.
    - MR. McHUGH: I object because it has not been redacted. This is the one we discussed yesterday about possibly redacting information from.
    - THE COURT: I don't remember discussing it. I apologize.
  - MR. MARTIN: No problem. I have no problem redacting. There's a reference to something

    Ms. Oredugba was going to do that afternoon related to

her family. I have no problem redacting that. 1 2 THE COURT: Great. Can you -- can we do that 3 without putting -- can we do that speedily? MR. MARTIN: I have a redactor. 4 5 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it's a piece 6 of personal information about her family that was 7 contained in an otherwise relevant e-mail. And just to 8 protect her privacy, the office privacy rights, we're 9 going to take it out. 10 We're not hiding anything from you. We're just 11 trying to assure that her privacy rights aren't 12 violated by seeing it. That's all. Other than that, Mr. McHugh, any objection? 13 14 MR. McHUGH: No, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Exhibit 12 will be admitted as a 16 full exhibit without objection as redacted. 17 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 12 admitted in full.) 18 Q. Okay. So at the top, CF, that's Chief Farrell? 19 I can't say with certainty. It would -- I would Α. 20 have to deduce that. 21 Q. He became very frustrated re: Franchina 22 situation. It says that? Is it across the bottom? Oh, yes. Yes. 23 Α. 24 became very frustrated re: Franchina situation." Yes. 25 Q. Now, shortly before this, didn't you learn that

charges had not, in fact, been brought against 1 2 Firefighter McGarty or Lieutenant Murphy? 3 Α. I don't recall. MR. MARTIN: Can I have just a minute? 4 THE COURT: 5 Sure. 6 MR. MARTIN: Page 77. Your Honor, I'm going to be referring to the deposition transcript of Olayinka 7 8 Oredugba, page 77, lines 14 through 19. 9 Q. Do you recall attending a deposition? 10 Yes, I do. Α. 11 And a deposition is an event in which you give Q. 12 testimony under oath? 13 Α. Correct. 14 Q. And you were represented by counsel? 15 Α. In relation to my position with the city. 16 Q. Mr. McHugh was there with you? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. And I asked you questions? 19 Α. Yes. 20 And you raised your hand and swore to tell the Q. 21 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? 22 Α. Yes. And on that day I said to you, "So I just want to 23 Q. 24 make sure I got this right. Prior to May 19th of 2010,

you had been advised that charges had been brought, a

hearing had been held and discipline had been meted out 1 2 in relation to the Firefighters' Hall incident?" 3 you wrote, "It was my understanding." Α. 4 Correct. 5 THE COURT: You mean --Α. 6 I said it. 7 THE COURT: She answered. 8 Q. You said it? Α. 9 Yes. And you asked him why it hadn't been done as you 10 Q. 11 had been promised in December; correct? 12 MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form. Use of the word "promised." 13 14 MR. MARTIN: Okay. I'll take out the word "promised." 15 16 Q. You asked him why discipline had not been meted 17 out as you were told in December it would be; correct? 18 Α. I don't recall. 19 Same page, your Honor and MR. MARTIN: 20 Mr. McHugh, starting on line 20. That's page 77. 21 Q. I said to you, "And then on May 19th of 2010, 22 Chief Tom Warren told you unequivocally that they had 23 not moved forward with any matters because it had been 24 handed over to the Law Department?" 25 MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form. Use of the

1 word "unequivocally." 2 THE COURT: Overruled. 3 Q. And then on the next page, you objected that you 4 couldn't speak to the word "unequivocally," and you said --5 6 I don't see that, but okay. 7 Q. You said, "I am not sure where they left off, but 8 he did say that on that day that I spoke with him that 9 they were not doing anything with the matter because they had handed it over to the Law Department. And, in 10 11 truth, I recall feeling frustrated by that." 12 Α. Correct. 13 Q. Okay. And the reason they had turned it over to 14 the Law Department was because they thought that 15 Ms. Franchina had filed a lawsuit? 16 Α. As I understand that, they turned it over to the 17 Law Department because they thought that's what they 18 were supposed to do. 19 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, same page, number 78, 20 starting with line 9. 21 "Did he say why they felt like they were not going Q. 22 to move forward because it resulted in litigation?" 23 Answer, "I think -- my understanding is that it

was his or their belief that was the proper procedure,

if the matter is in litigation, that they hand it to

24

1 the Law Department." Did I read that correctly? 2 Α. Yes, you did. 3 Q. So back in December they had handed it over to HR 4 because they believed it was going to result in 5 litigation; correct? 6 Α. They attempted to. 7 Q. And you handed it back and said, You handle it 8 even if it is in litigation? 9 Α. I didn't say "even if it is," I mean; but we, HR, 10 advised them to proceed with their procedures. 11 Q. And there was no litigation in December of 2009 12 that you're aware of? I don't actually know when the Complaint was 13 14 filed. 15 But as of December of 2009 you had no belief that Q. 16 litigation had been filed? 17 I did not have knowledge of it being in 18 litigation. 19 And even if litigation had been filed, that would Q. 20 not be a justifiable reason to not discipline people 21 who were deserving of discipline? 22 MR. McHUGH: Objection. 23 THE COURT: Overruled.

Within the fire department?

In this specific case.

24

25

Α.

Q.

- 1 A. That's my understanding. That's my belief.
- Q. And then after HR, you, handed it back to them,
- 3 they handed it off to the Law Department; correct?
  - A. I don't know what they did specifically after my conversation.
- Q. When I read to you that you said back in May at your deposition that you felt really frustrated after you found out about it, what was it that made you so
- A. Because it appeared that they may not have followed through with what I thought that they did.
  - **Q**. Did you advise them that they should follow through in May of 2010?
- 14 A. I may have. I don't recall.
  - **Q**. Do you know of anybody who was ever actually disciplined for the Firefighters' Hall incident regarding Lori Franchina?
- 18 A. I do not know.

frustrated?

4

5

9

12

13

15

16

17

- MR. MARTIN: I'm going to show the witness
  Exhibit 14.
- Q. Ms. Oredugba, I'm showing you what's marked as
  Plaintiff's Exhibit 14, if you could just take a minute
  to read that.
  - A. Yes. I've read it.
- 25 Q. Okay. This is an e-mail from you to you?

1 Α. It is. 2 Dated November 19th of 2010? Q. 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. And this is in the same or substantially the same 5 condition as it was when you wrote it? Well, there's something crossed out at the end. 6 Α. 7 I don't recall doing that, but it's possible. 8 I. . . Q. 9 What about the handwritten part up in the corner, 10 is that your handwriting? 11 Α. It appears so. 12 So other than the crossed-out part, does 13 everything appear to be the same as when you handwrote 14 on the printout of this e-mail? 15 Α. It does. 16 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as 17 Exhibit 14. 18 MR. McHUGH: Objection. It's not the same. 19 It's not a true and accurate copy of the original. 20 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, may we approach? 21 THE COURT: No. Overruled. The exhibit can be 22 admitted as full. 23 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 14 admitted in full.) 24 Q. In the handwritten portion, ma'am, it says, 25 "Please draft letter to memorialize direction to PFD,

1 re: con. with C. Farrell"; correct?

- A. I believe so. I was actually having difficulty reading the writing.
  - Q. I should have been a doctor. And then it says "cc Morgan and Warren"; correct?
    - A. It does say "cc Morgan." That could be Warren.
- Q. Did you ever draft a letter to memorialize your direction to the Providence Fire Department regarding that conversation?
  - A. Not that I recall.

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

- **Q.** Do you remember -- it says "memorialize direction to PFD." Do you remember what direction you had given to PFD in November of 2010?
- 14 A. I don't believe I had given them direction in 2010.
- 16 **Q**. But you were talking about writing the letter in 2010?
  - A. Right. At times I will write reminders as to something that I want to do or have done ultimately.
  - **Q.** In your mind, this is a note to yourself to give direction to the Providence Fire Department, not about direction that you had given?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. What was the direction that you were going to give the fire

1 department if you had written a letter? 2 MR. McHUGH: Objection. Calls for speculation, 3 form. 4 THE COURT: Why don't you rephrase. 5 MR. MARTIN: Sure. 6 Q. Do you recall at the time you planned on giving 7 directions what those directions were? 8 No, because at that time I don't think I had 9 drawn -- that I had directions to give at that time. 10 Now, a long time had -- well, about six months had Q. 11 elapsed between the last e-mail I showed you and this 12 e-mail: correct? 13 Α. Yes. The May, yes. 14 Q. And at this point in time you knew that Lori 15 Franchina was out on stress leave? 16 Α. I did not, no. I don't know -- in my course of 17 work, I don't -- I'm not necessarily alerted if one is 18 out or when they're in or when someone retires. 19 Q. Didn't something happen or some conversation that 20 triggered you six months later to write yourself a 21 note? 22 Α. More likely than not. 23 Q. You just don't remember what it was? 24 Α. Correct. 25 Q. At the top it says "OYO." Those are your

initials?

- **A**. They are.
- Q. "Notes." And in bold it says, "acknowledge harassment, believe it to be so." Is that you saying that you believed harassment to be so?
  - A. That's not me saying that. That's putting -- in my notes at times on various matters I may write certain possibilities. So I may make note if it's X or I may make note if it's the opposite, Y, and with the ultimate intention of filling in the facts that have been ascertained to support X or Y.
  - Q. Okay. Well, in this case when you wrote "acknowledge harassment, believe it to be so," what did you mean?
  - A. I don't -- I couldn't say.
  - **Q**. Do you know what you meant when you wrote "not convinced that it is sexual harassment"?
  - A. It could be just as I explained where I may, you know, write, like, hypothetically if, say, one were saying guilty, not guilty, and then you'd plug in facts to support each.

So, in short, they're just notes. I often write notes to trigger my own memory, but then I will also have all of my other notes in front of me that I can refer to.

One reason I do that is because I have numerous 1 2 simultaneous matters that I want to try to remember 3 what goes with what matter, what department. 4 Q. Do you feel like you have -- at this time had too 5 many things to complete this the way that you wanted 6 to? Α. Yes. 7 8 Q. It's fair to say, ma'am, that you're a highly 9 educated attorney; correct? 10 Α. I don't --11 And you have experience, you've been a trial Q. 12 lawyer? 13 Α. Somewhat. Not a jury trial, but. . . 14 Q. Was there some personal drive that led you to 15 working in the City of Providence's EEO office? 16 Α. No. 17 Do you believe that it's important to eradicate 18 things like harassment and discrimination and 19 retaliation for making complaints of harassment or 20 discrimination? 21 I think it's important to address EEO matters. Α. 22 Q. Do you feel like you have the resources to do that 23 to the best of your -- at this time, 2008, 2009 and

2010, that you were provided with the resources to do

that to the best of your ability?

24

```
1
              MR. McHUGH:
                            Objection.
                                        Relevance.
 2
              THE COURT: Overruled.
 3
      Α.
            No.
 4
              MR. MARTIN: Can I show the witness Exhibit 17.
 5
      Actually, you know what, I'm going to go up.
 6
      Q.
            I'm going to bring up to you what's been marked as
 7
      Exhibit 17 because it's three pages.
 8
      Α.
            Thank you. Yes.
9
      Q.
            Ms. Oredugba, Exhibit Number 17 is an e-mail from
10
      you to you?
11
      Α.
            I believe so. I didn't look at that part.
12
      Q.
            Sorry.
13
      Α.
            Yes.
            Dated November 24th, 2010?
14
      Q.
15
      Α.
           Yes.
16
      Q.
            And this is in the same or substantially the same
17
      condition as it was when you wrote it?
18
      Α.
            It appears so.
19
              MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, we offer this as
20
       Exhibit 17.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Any objection?
22
              MR. McHUGH: No objection, your Honor.
23
                          Exhibit 17 is admitted as a full
              THE COURT:
24
       exhibit and can be shown to the jury.
25
              (Plaintiff's Exhibit 17 admitted in full.)
```

**Q**. There's a lot to these three pages, so I'm going to jump around a little bit. Do you recall why you wrote notes to yourself on November 24th of 2010?

- A. Why on that specific date?
- **Q**. Or just why in general in that timeframe, November of 2010, why you were writing another note to yourself.
- A. Not with respect to that date or timeframe, but I recall that I had a number of matters and some, like this, that I felt needed -- that I needed to review.
- **Q**. Do you remember why you felt at this point in time that you needed to review the Franchina matter?
- A. No.

- **Q**. On the second page of the exhibit you wrote, "Chief Farrell said that following our meeting last year, he met with all the chiefs in Providence Fire Department, told them it's their responsibility to assist her." That's regarding Lori?
- A. Presumably, but I couldn't say.
- **Q**. "If they find out about these things, tell the lieutenants and captains they have to do their job"?
- A. That's what it says.
- **Q**. And then down below, "He says he believes that if the officers know that they will be called in and given a verbal warning, then they will take corrective action." Correct?

1 A. That's what it says.

- **Q**. And those are in regards to Lori's complaints about insubordination and other things that she complained about to all of you; correct?
  - A. Presumably. I don't know that -- I don't know whether the directive was just as it applies to Lori or that it was in general across the board.
    - **Q**. And below you made some notations regarding information you obtained from Chief Crawford; correct?
    - A. Where it says "Chief Crawford reading notes"?
- **Q**. Yes.

- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And that says that the number of guys who will not help her is increasing?
  - A. It says, "The number of guys who will not help her is increasing." That's what it says.
    - **Q**. And that was as of 10/5, 2010, October 5th, 2010?
    - A. Yes, that's what it says.
- **Q**. He said that she has Form 17s dating back to 2006 that have never been addressed?
  - A. Whether or not he said it, I have, "Chief Crawford reading notes from 10/15/10," and then three bullets, the second one being, "She has Form 17s dating back to 2006 that have never been addressed." I don't know whether he is saying that or he is saying what she has

said. 1 2 Well, I understand that you were busy at the time, Q. 3 but you certainly took care to make sure that your 4 notes were accurate; correct? 5 I certainly wrote what I believed to be hearing at Α. 6 the time. 7 Q. And because you were busy and because you have 8 such a large caseload, you know that you can't humanly 9 be expected to remember every detail of every case; 10 right? 11 MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form. 12 Mischaracterizes the testimony. 13 THE COURT: Overruled. 14 Α. I can't speak to what's a human expectation, but I 15 know that I personally won't remember everything. 16 Q. And the reason that you make these reports is so 17 that later on down the road you can refer to them and 18 remind yourself of things that you may have forgotten? 19 Α. Well, it's not a report. These are notes; and 20 they're notes so that, in an ideal circumstance, I can 21 prepare a report. 22 And certainly if you're creating notes so that you 23 could create a report, your notes are going to be as 24 accurate as you can possibly make them?

Objection. She just said she

25

MR. McHUGH:

1 doesn't make reports. 2 THE COURT: Overruled. 3 Α. No. 4 Q. Is there anything about this note that leads you 5 to believe that your notes are inaccurate? 6 Α. When you say my notes, the entire document or --7 Q. This one that we're looking at right here where it 8 says, "She has Form 17s dating back to 2006 that have 9 never been addressed." 10 Α. 0h. I don't take issue with my having written 11 that. 12 Q. Okay. 13 It's just that it doesn't -- again, as I stated, 14 it doesn't say whether -- Chief Crawford may have been 15 relaying to me what she relayed to him. 16 Q. I see. 17 Just as it says next to that, "And if she has not 18 done so, " I'm not sure what that means. 19 Q. Right. So -- but you agree that it doesn't say 20 Franchina told Crawford, it says that Crawford told 21 vou? 22 It also doesn't say Crawford told me. It just --23 above it, it says Chief Crawford reading notes from 24 10/15 -- 10/5/10, and then it has three bullet points.

Then two lines down it says, "Crawford believes

25

Q.

1 that 90 percent of what she says is true."

A. It does say that.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

23

24

- Q. So that part, is there any confusion about what that part means sitting here reading it today?
  - A. I can only go by what it says, "Crawford believes 90 percent."
  - Q. So even if she did relay to him two sentences up, even if she was the source of information that she had Form 17s dating back to 2006 that have never been addressed, Crawford then followed up by telling you, Hey, I think 90 percent of what she says is true?
  - A. That is what my notes say, and I do not dispute that I wrote that Crawford believes 90 percent of what she says is true. I cannot guarantee that all of this was said in that sequence within that matter of time.
  - **Q**. And then below that -- by the way, right here, after that line, has something been whited out?
  - **A**. Not to my knowledge.
- 19 **Q**. Okay. There's just spaces?
  - A. I believe so.
- 21 Q. Nothing was deleted or anything?
- A. No, not to my knowledge.
  - **Q**. Okay. And then it says, "Believe there appears to be ample merit to her claim of multiple and repeated violations of PFD rules and regulations." Was that

your opinion or was that what Chief Crawford relayed to you?

- A. It wasn't my opinion. I don't know whether that's what Chief Crawford relayed to me.
- Q. Well, it's under your Chief Crawford notes; correct?
  - A. I mean, it is what comes next; but the three dots that are above the sentence, usually when I do that, it means I'm -- it's something separate.
    - **Q**. Then it goes on to say, "Even seems plausible that the pervasiveness of this behavior creates a hostile work environment for her, also seems clear that PFD has failed to stop the behavior"; correct?
    - A. It does say that.

- **Q**. Was that your opinion or was that something that was relayed to you from Chief Crawford?
- A. It wasn't my opinion. I don't recall Chief Crawford saying anything that emphatically or saying that that emphatically.
- Q. So it's here in this note, but we, or you, rather, don't know where it came from?
  - A. I don't recall at the moment, but it is here in the notes.
- Q. And on the next page at the top it says, "You punish one officer, which makes that officer's

subordinates angry, and they want to retaliate against Franchina," et cetera, et cetera and so forth. You wrote that?

- A. "Et cetera and so forth." It's in the notes that I wrote, yes.
- **Q**. Was that your opinion or was that something that you learned from Chief Crawford?
- A. I don't -- it was not my opinion. I don't recall
  Chief Crawford saying that.
- **Q**. Okay. As the EEO officer, are you aware in 2007 of what level of proof was required to show harassment, discrimination or retaliation before you were required to make a recommendation, a corrective recommendation?

MR. McHUGH: Objection as to form, "required." THE COURT: Overruled.

- **A**. We don't actually have -- "we" being the city or city HR, we don't have regulations as stringent as that.
- **Q**. What do you mean when you say you don't have regulations as stringent as that?
- A. Well, you said what level of proof or evidence would be required before I have to make a recommendation. So the answer I guess would be no.
- **Q**. No. No, you don't know what it is or no, it doesn't exist?

A. It could be either, both.

- **Q**. What level of proof did you require in 2007, 2008 and 2009 before you would recommend that corrective action be taken?
  - A. I don't recall. Perhaps a preponderance of evidence. Perhaps clear and convincing. I actually don't recall, honestly.
  - **Q**. But you do recall that there's no required action after a certain level of proof; is that right?
  - A. I mean, there's certainly a required level of action if you're aware that there's an imminent threat of bodily harm either to the complainant or the complainant has said that they are about to do imminent bodily harm to someone else.
  - Q. This is page 11, excuse me, starting with line 4.
    I asked you, "But what is the standard that you typically" --
  - MR. McHUGH: I'm going to object. The question should be read first instead of reading in the middle of the -- the middle of it. Start on page 10, line 25.

    MR. MARTIN: Sure. Okay.
  - Q. So I said, "I think that's a fair point."

    THE COURT: Pull it up, Mr. Martin.

    MR. MARTIN: Oh, sorry.
- Q. "I think that's a fair point. I don't want to put

words into your mouth. If I'm doing that at any point, just let me know, just like you did. So I guess we're not talking about how you've been trained, but what is the standard that you typically apply when you determine whether or not you think that there's enough evidence to warrant further action at the conclusion of your investigation? Is unequivocal the standard?"

And you said, "No. I'd say admittedly I don't -- I don't consciously think of the standard; but reflecting on it now, I would say probably more clear and convincing." Did I read that correctly?

A. Yes.

- **Q**. And then I asked you, "Have you found there to be clear and convincing evidence that Ms. Franchina had been harassed or discriminated against?" And you answered, "No." Correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And then I asked, "Did you find there to be a preponderance of the evidence that she had been harassed or discriminated against?" And you said, "In a couple of situations." Correct?
- A. That's what I said.
- **Q**. Is preponderance of the evidence and reasonable belief, are those similar standards?
- 25 A. It could be argued they are.

1 Q. But I don't want to argue with you. I just want 2 to know what you think. 3 I mean, I see preponderance of the evidence maybe 4 51 percent. Reasonable belief may not, may not 5 quite -- they're similar. I wouldn't see them as being 6 exactly the same. 7 Q. Reasonable belief is lower than a preponderance of 8 the evidence? 9 Α. In my perception. 10 Q. And clear and convincing is higher? Yes. 11 Α. 12 MR. MARTIN: One second. 13 (Pause.) 14 MR. MARTIN: I'm going to refer back to what's 15 already in evidence as Exhibit Number 3. Is Exhibit 16 Number 3 in evidence? 17 Three is full. THE CLERK: 18 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. 19 Again, this is the EEO Complaint Information Form Q. 20 that was in effect in May of 2007; correct? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. And here in this fourth paragraph it says, "Once a 23 complaint is filed, the matter is investigated. 24 determination of reasonable cause to believe that the

unlawful discrimination or harassment occurred, the

1 department administrator or supervisor concerned will 2 be notified of the allegations. 3 "If it is the department administrator or 4 supervisor who is alleged to have committed a 5 prohibited act, the EEO officer will confer with and refer the matter to the Director of Human Resources for 6 7 appropriate action. 8 "Upon completion of the investigation, the EEO 9 officer will make a determination of findings and 10 provide recommendations for corrective action." Correct? 11 12 That's what it says. 13 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I have nothing further. 14 THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Martin. 15 Mr. McHugh? 16 MR. McHUGH: I'm going to reserve on this 17 witness, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Great. You can step down, ma'am. 19 Thank you. 20 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 21 MR. MARTIN: The Plaintiff calls Danielle Masse. 22 THE COURT: Usually during breaks I find time --23 I don't think I told you this during selection. 24 always ask about what the oar is for. Have any of you 25 wondered why we have an oar?

I like to joke that it's to whack lawyers if they go on too long, but I have not done that yet. We have admiralty jurisdiction in the federal courts, which means anything that occurs on the high seas or on any navigable waters, any disputes, whether it's seamen not being paid or fishermen not being paid or boats that haven't been repaired properly or accidents at sea or anything that happens on navigable waters, you can bring that claim to Federal Court.

And years ago when courts sat, you know, depending on the topic, they would take the oar and they'd put it out front of the courthouse; and it would say to all the seamen or the captains or boat owners or injured people that they could bring their dispute in admiralty into court.

So it's been a tradition of Federal Court -- oh, you can come up. It's a tradition of Federal Court that we keep that in here, and it reminds us that we have admiralty jurisdiction. And if you were hearing an admiralty case, the tradition is you would put it on the bench.

At some point during this period you were going to wonder what that is. Wait until I explain the Great Seal to you during another break and who's staring at us. We're going to save that one.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α.

Mr. Martin. Oh, would you rise and let Ms. McGuire swear you in. DANIELLE MASSE, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN THE CLERK: Please state your name and spell your last name for the record. THE WITNESS: Danielle Masse, M-A-S-S-E. THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated. THE COURT: Is it Officer Masse or --THE WITNESS: Lieutenant. Lieutenant Masse, if you'd just get THE COURT: comfortable in the chair, why don't you try that now, and then just pull the microphone in. You have to speak right into it. The whole base moves. It's particularly important because it sounds like your voice may be a little low for you to speak right into it. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Great. Thank you, Lieutenant. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MARTIN: Q. Good afternoon, Lieutenant. Could you tell us where you're from. From Providence, Rhode Island. Α. Where did you go to school? Q.

Well, I'm originally from Dighton, Massachusetts,

- 1 but I went to school at Dighton-Rehobeth High School.
- 2 **Q**. And how far did you go in school?
- A. I'm currently finishing up my bachelor's degree in public administration at Roger Williams University.
  - Q. What did you do after you left high school?
- A. When I was a senior, actually when I was a junior
   in high school, I joined the Army. I did my basic
   training finishing year of high school and then
   continued with the Army and with my college education.
- 10 **Q**. Are you still enlisted?
- 11 A. I am.

16

17

18

21

22

- 12 Q. How long have you been enlisted?
- A. A total of 11 years. I did eight years, had about an eight-year break in service, and I'm currently back in in the Rhode Island National Guard.
  - Q. So eight years' break in service, then an additional three years?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Any special certifications or trainings that you obtained in the military?
  - A. Yes. I joined as a medic for the Mass. National Guard, and then I transferred to the Reserves as a drill sergeant.
- Q. Are you a little bit nervous about testifying here today?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- $2 \mid \mathbf{Q}$ . Why is that?
- 3 A. I don't like public speaking.
- 4 Q. Well, you're doing fine.
- 5 A. Thank you.
- Q. When did you start to work for the Providence Fire
  Department?
- 8 A. In 2001.

12

13

14

15

- 9 **Q**. And can you tell us how you came to be a part of the Providence Fire Department.
  - A. I started taking karate when I was 12, and a number of my instructors at the karate school were on the Providence Fire Department, and they spoke about it being a secure job and challenging, and it sounded like something I'd be interested in.
    - Q. When did you go to the academy?
- 17 **A.** March of 2001.
- 18 **Q**. And obviously you finished?
- 19 **A**. Yes.
- Q. So tell us, what was your original job once you came out of the academy?
- A. The first few months as a firefighter. Every couple of weeks they had us going to different ladder and engine companies to learn the job.
- Q. And then what was your next job or your next rank?

- A. Well, I was assigned a few months later as a
   firefighter.
- Q. And did you eventually transition to Emergency
  Medical Services?
  - A. I did.

14

15

18

19

- $\mathbf{Q}$ . When was that?
- 7 **A**. In 2006.
- Q. Any particular trainings or experience that you obtained between 2001 and 2006 that led to the transition?
- A. I continuously had EMT training through the military, and the fire department sent me to EMT-Cardiac school.
  - Q. When did you become a lieutenant?
    - **A**. Became a lieutenant in 2007.
- Q. Can you describe for us what it's like for you as a female working on the Providence Fire Department.
  - A. It's been much more difficult than I had envisioned it to be.
  - **Q**. Why is that?
- A. Coming from the military, I figured that having
  a -- being in good physical condition, being, you know,
  motivated and knowing how to do my job would be enough
  to be considered a competent member of the department;
  and that has not been the case.

Are there specific areas of your work performance 1 Q. 2 or your work environment that you found to be 3 challenging? 4 Α. There's been a lot of challenges, yes. 5 Particularly, being deemed competent to do my job has -- I don't know. I constantly have had my 6 7 competency put into question in ways that it shouldn't 8 be. Q. 9 Does that include during your experience as a 10 lieutenant? Α. 11 Yes. 12 Does that include from subordinate members of the Q. 13 department? 14 Α. Yes. 15 I'm going to object, leading. MR. McHUGH: 16 THE COURT: Sustained. Be careful, Mr. Martin. 17 That's all. 18 Could you tell us -- describe for us what made you 19 feel as if your competency was being questioned. 20 Α. Multiple times throughout my career, like when I 21 was going to become a lieutenant, the officer who I 22 worked for when I was a tech stated that he didn't feel 23 I was competent to do the job; and they decided not to

have me act as an officer, and there was no basis or

foundation; and my education in EMS and my experience

24

in EMS were greater than that person's.

- **Q**. When you say greater than that person's, you mean the person who did get the promotion?
- A. No. The person who told the chief and the chief that made that decision, my knowledge of protocol and just the daily workings of how to do my job as an EMT were greater than that officer, yet they decided not to put me in charge; and I had to fight to be put in charge, and there was no reason for it other than they just didn't want to put me in the position.
- **Q**. Sorry to be personal, but could you please tell us your sexual orientation.
- A. I'm a lesbian.

- **Q**. And how do you feel that women in general are treated on the department?
- A. Women are treated as less competent.
- **Q**. Can you give me examples besides yourself in which you've observed that type of treatment.
- A. Women who have been in charge are not given the -just the respect by subordinates. They're not seen as
  actually being of -- like, of being in charge. They're
  spoken to as if they have no authority by subordinates.

When issues are brought to the chain of command, the chain of command doesn't take them seriously, doesn't deal with them appropriately and then in effect

turns them around and treats them as if the problem is because of the women on the job and usually find some way to say that the women caused the problem, whether it was, you know, describing their tone of voice as squealing when a man in that same position would have been considered authoritative and competent and professional.

**Q**. Does that treatment that you just described, does that include women who are available to date their male co-workers?

MR. McHUGH: Objection, leading.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. There are a number of women on the job that have been in relationships with men, and they seem to get treated differently. They have protection of some sort. Other members don't seem to treat them as negatively when they're in a relationship.
- **Q**. Have you ever had an intimate relationship with a male superior while you were employed by the Providence Fire Department?
- A. I have.

- **Q**. Who was that?
- A. Lieutenant Michael Segee.
- Q. What was your rank when you dated Lieutenant
  Michael Segee?

A. Within the first few months finishing the fire academy while they were moving us from company to company, I had a relationship with Lieutenant Michael Segee. I was assigned to Engine 3 for a few weeks.

- **Q**. A moment ago you just described in general that people who dated men on the job seemed to have protection. When you were dating a man on the job, did you have any type of experiences consistent with that observation?
  - MR. McHUGH: Objection, leading.
  - THE COURT: Overruled.
- A. I did.

- Q. Could you tell us about that.
- A. Yes. When I first got on the job, it was stressful. It had already proved through the academy and the first few weeks of the job to be not as simple to fit in and, you know, be treated according to how we performed as firefighters.

And so Lieutenant Segee was really nice and supportive, and I found him easy to get along with.

One day he sent me upstairs to the third floor of the headquarters to have my name put on a detail list so that I could have -- take details to get extra pay.

At that time we, as a practice, would leave our portable radios on the coats -- in the coats on the

truck. And so when he sent me up to the third floor, I didn't know the voc alarms, they're the machine that, like, the tone goes off and it tells you where the run is, up on the third floor the voc alarms either didn't work or were turned off, and I didn't know that. And so while I was up there, I missed a run.

- Q. Can you describe what that means to miss a run.
- A. It's a violation of the rules and regulations, but culturally as -- more so as a new person, to miss a run, it's -- you're treated based upon how well you do certain things, like, you know, making sure that you, you know, do the housework and going on runs; and those small things show, I guess, your effort.

And to miss a run is like one of the worst things as a new person that you could do because it just -- it shows possible lack of motivation, and it's a really bad thing.

- **Q**. And what type of consequences did you experience for missing the run?
- A. I didn't.

- **Q**. Do you know why?
- A. Yes. The lieutenant, Mike Segee, told the members on the truck not to say anything. He knew that he sent me upstairs and that I probably didn't know about the voc alarm, and so he told them not to say anything and

1 to forget that it happened.

I don't necessarily think that would have been the case if he and I weren't in that relationship.

- **Q**. Tell us about when you first met Lori Franchina, or actually do you know Lori Franchina?
- A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

- 7 Q. Can you tell us about when you first met her.
  - A. I met Lori in 2002 at a club one night.
- 9 **Q**. Were you working for the fire department at that 10 time?
- 11 A. Yes. I was employed for about a year.
- 12 **Q**. Was she working for the fire department at that time?
- 14 A. She was in the fire academy.
- Q. Can you tell us about your relationship after you met.
- 17 A. We dated for 10 months.
- 18  $\mathbf{Q}$ . When it ended after 10 months, was it amicable?
- 19 **A**. It was.
- 20 Q. So have you met -- did you say it was 2002?
- A. Yes, in 2002. Probably May of 2002 until I think
  March of 2003.
- Q. What was your relationship like after March of 2003?
- A. We didn't talk very much for a while after that.

1 I needed some time away. But it wasn't contentious.

- Q. What about in the end of 2006 and the beginning of 2007, what was your relationship with her like then?
  - A. We were friends.

- **Q**. And what about after the beginning of 2007, what was your relationship like then?
- A. We stopped talking as much, and I separated from contact with her for a while.
- Q. Why did you separate from contact with her?
- A. Because it was proving difficult to be friends with her and feel safe at work. I was concerned that if I maintained contact and people at work knew, because of the way that they spoke about her at work, that I might be in danger and my work environment would
- **Q.** How did you hear people speak about her that made you feel that way?
- A. She was a pretty general topic of conversation in the stations. People spoke really poorly of her.
- Q. Did she have any nicknames?

become really difficult.

- A. She had a lot of nicknames and derogatory comments to describe her.
  - **Q**. Can you give us some examples of the nicknames and derogatory comments you heard them use to describe her.
  - A. Called her Frangina, bitch, quite a few other

1 really awful things.

- **Q**. Can you give us examples of any of the other awful things? Just so that you know, you have permission to use profanity in a federal courthouse for the purpose of giving testimony.
- A. They used the C word. They called her a cunt and words like that.
  - **Q**. How often would you hear people refer to her as a bitch or Frangina or the C word?
  - A. Quite often, and those are the words that they used. They never used her real name.
  - Q. Was it always that way or was there a certain point in time when you noticed that started happening?
  - A. For the first few years that she was on the job, it wasn't bad like that; but after she became an acting lieutenant, I started to notice that people were having negative things to say and calling her those things.
  - **Q**. Sorry. Were you done? Did you ever hear anything about her and Andre Ferro?
  - A. Yes.
  - **Q**. What did you hear?
  - A. I heard that he did some pretty crazy things and that he took his pants off in front of the emergency room and had some pretty awful things to say about her.
  - Q. Did you hear anything about the fact that he was

fired for doing that? Did anyone ever talk about that?

A. Yes.

Q. What did they say about that?

A. They laughed about it. They thought it was funny.

Q. They thought it was funny that he was fired?

A. The whole scenario. They thought it was funny what he had done and how he had treated her and that, you know, they said he would probably end up getting his job back.

Q. I want to talk to you about your work experience since you've become part of this case. Do you know --

MR. McHUGH: Well, objection, leading. And "part of this case," what does that mean?

THE COURT: I think we'll soon find out. Go ahead, Mr. Martin.

- **Q**. Do you know when you were disclosed publicly as a witness on behalf of Lori Franchina in this case?
- A. Yes.

- **Q**. When was that?
- A. When I found out, it was in December, around Christmas of 2014.
  - Q. Anything interesting happen at work after that?
  - A. Yes. At the end of December, on the 30th, I was brought into the chief's office and accusations were made against me by the chief. He filed charges against

1 me.

- **Q**. Now, in your eight or so years with the military and your -- in 2015, that would be 14 years on the department?
- A. Yes.
- **Q.** So in your 20 or so years as a soldier and as an EMT and firefighter, how many times have you ever been informed that you were being brought up on disciplinary charges?
- A. Never.
- **Q**. Do you recall the approximate date of when you attended a deposition in this case?
  - A. It was first or second week of September 2015.
  - **Q**. Anything interesting happen in work around the first or second week of September of 2015?
    - A. I was notified that they were scheduling a hearing to file charges against me formally.
  - **Q**. What were the charges about?
    - A. About a run that I went on where I transported a patient to the emergency room who had been high on heroin and crashed his car where a state trooper tried to bully me into signing a refusal for that patient, and I didn't do that because it's against the rules and regulations to sign refusals for patients who are altered, and I transported that patient to the

hospital.

- **Q.** I just want to break that up. When you say it's against policies and procedures to accept a refusal from a person who's altered, first of all, what do you mean by the phrase "altered"?
- A. A person who is under the influence of drugs or alcohol or intoxicating substances or who has a serious head injury cannot sign a refusal. They need to be treated as if they're a child, and they're assumed that they can't make appropriate medical decisions.

And so until they've been cleared by the hospital, we as pre-hospital providers cannot sign a refusal. They have to be cleared by a doctor before they can be allowed to go.

- **Q**. So you mentioned a couple of things, head injuries and drugs. What evidence had you seen that there was a potential head injury to this person?
- A. The person had drove their car down the highway, crashed into the barrier on the exit. There was about a foot of intrusion into the engine compartment of the car, which in EMS terms is considered a significant amount.

The windshield was cracked above where the patient was sitting in a circle where it appeared as though the head had hit the windshield. The airbags

had gone off. So at highway speeds, hitting the car, that showed there was a problem.

The patient also had pinpoint pupils, he wasn't speaking appropriately, he had vomited and just wasn't acting normal.

- **Q.** So that's for the head injury. What was the evidence that made you suspect there may have been use of drugs?
- A. I'm sorry, I combined the two, but the pinpoint pupils are an indicator of drugs; and then symptoms of a head injury and use of narcotics or alcohol sometimes are similar where they might not be speaking appropriately or behaving appropriately. Those are symptoms of both of those things.
- **Q**. So who was it that complained that you transported a patient exhibiting those symptoms?
- A. Apparently the patient made a written statement, and the trooper stated that I squealed at him. And so I guess the state troopers forwarded information to the department about that complaint.
- **Q**. So we've discussed when you were disclosed as a witness.
- A. Uh-huh.

**Q**. And when you were deposed. When did you receive your subpoena to testify here today?

1 A. Last week.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

21

22

23

24

25

- **Q**. Anything interesting happen at work last week?
- A. I was suspended for two-and-a-half weeks without pay, 10 days, 10 working days. I was removed from the rescue captains' list. I've been acting as a rescue captain for the last year and a half.

I was given a letter of reprimand in my permanent file; and then on that same day, a few hours later, I received the subpoena to testify here.

- **Q**. Are you planning on fighting back about those?
- 11 A. Absolutely.
- Q. And who have you chosen as an attorney to help you do that?
- 14 A. Excuse me?
- Q. Who have you chosen as an attorney to help you do that?
- 17 **A**. You.
- Q. When you -- let me think of how I want to say
  this. When you dated the lieutenant, you said you felt
  that you were given certain protections.
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. What was it like after you were no longer dating the lieutenant?
  - A. A few -- I think, like I said, for the first few months on the job, we were assigned to different

companies for a few weeks at a time to get some 1 2 experience at different companies; and like I said, a 3 few months later, I think around November of that first 4 year, they assigned me to Engine 2. 5 When the paper came out for me to be assigned 6 there, I was warned by a female firefighter who had 7 been one of the first females hired to watch my back. 8 MR. McHUGH: I'm going to object, hearsay. 9 THE COURT: Overruled. 10 Q. What did the female firefighter warn you? 11 She told me to watch my back with the individuals Α. 12 on that group at that station because they -- she 13 didn't really give much more detail than that, but 14 basically watch out for those individuals. 15 Q. Aren't you afraid of what's going to happen from 16 you coming here today? 17 MR. McHUGH: Objection, leading. 18 THE COURT: Sustained. 19 Q. Just to be clear, what do you think of the guys 20 you work with currently on your current crew? 21 Α. At Atwells Avenue, I've had a great experience, 22 and I'm supported by the members that I work with. 23 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. Nothing further. 24 THE COURT: Thanks.

Mr. McHugh, are you going to be short or should

we take the afternoon break? 1 2 MR. McHUGH: I think we should probably take the 3 break. 4 THE COURT: Sure. Ladies and gentlemen, we'll 5 take our 3:00 break. We'll see you back in about 15 or 6 20 minutes. 7 (Recess.) 8 THE COURT: Lieutenant, you understand that 9 you're still under oath? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Great. Mr. McHugh. 12 MR. McHUGH: Thank you, your Honor. 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. McHUGH: 15 Lieutenant, I want to ask you some questions about Q. 16 the incident you brought up that you're currently under 17 suspension for. Okay? 18 Α. Okay. 19 Q. And that incident occurred on Sunday, 20 December 14th, 2014; correct? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. And that was on Route 95? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. And when you arrived on the scene, Lieutenant 25 Sullivan had already begun an assessment of the

1 patient? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. And the State Police were already there at the 4 time; correct? 5 Α. Yes. And then when you arrived, you took over the 6 Q. assessment from Lieutenant Sullivan as the acting 7 8 captain of the rescue; correct? Yes. 9 Α. 10 And you asked the patient several times if he 11 wanted to go to the hospital; correct? 12 I asked the patient, yes, if he wanted to go to 13 the hospital several times. 14 Q. And he said no; right? 15 He was under the influence, and what he said 16 didn't matter. I was using the refusal protocol to 17 determine whether or not he actually could refuse, and 18 I used that and determined that he could not refuse by 19 the way he was answering. 20 So yes, he did say "no" multiple times, but he 21 never had the option of refusing because he was altered 22 and did not meet the qualifications to sign a refusal. 23 Q. He was under the influence, and that's why the 24 State Police were doing a criminal investigation;

25

correct?

A. At that time the State Police had said nothing
about the incident or whether he was under
investigation. All I knew at that time, all I was
trying to determine if he could sign a refusal was that
he crashed his car into the barrier, which I had seen
when I walked by it. Otherwise, I had no other

- **Q**. Okay. But when you arrived, the State Police were there; correct?
- 10 A. They're always on scene on highway accidents when
  11 I arrive.
- 12 **Q**. Okay. And they were there on this day, 13 December 14th; correct?

information to go on.

14 **A**. Yes.

7

8

9

15

16

17

20

24

- **Q**. And you subsequently learned that the State Police had put out this individual's license plate due to a report of erratic driving; correct?
- A. About, I would say, a year later, maybe nine months later.
  - Q. That's when you learned it?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. And you told one of the state troopers to stand back, didn't you?
  - A. I asked him if he could back up because he was so close that he was spitting in my face and he was

- interfering with me assessing the patient. So yes, I 1 2 asked him respectfully if he could back up.
- 3 And he didn't; right?
- 4 Α. He did not, no.

Q.

- Because he told you you had no jurisdiction 5 Q. 6 over the State Police; correct?
- 7 Α. No, he didn't say that to me.
- 8 Q. He was -- they were in the process of searching 9 the car, also; correct?
- 10 Α. I don't know what they were doing, no. There was 11 a few troopers standing next to me.
- 12 Q. You didn't see the trooper search the car?
- 13 Α. The car was behind me. So no, I did not see what 14 they were doing.
- 15 Q. Did you see the trooper take a little 16 plastic bag out of the car?
- 17 Α. I did not.
- 18 And you subsequently transported the individual to 19 the hospital; correct?
- 20 Α. I did.
- 21 And what happened after you transported him to the 22 hospital?
- 23 Α. I don't understand your question.
- 24 Did you just transport him to the hospital and Q. 25 then leave?

- 1 A. No. I called my chief to the hospital.
- Q. Okay. Why did you call your chief to the hospital?
  - A. Because the trooper had been extremely rude and interfered with my attempt to assess the patient and yelled at me and verbally brandished me on scene while I was trying to assess whether or not the patient could sign a refusal.
  - **Q**. So you thought that the State Police actually interfered with your assessment; correct?
- 11 A. Absolutely.
- Q. And subsequently the State Police complained to the City of Providence about you; right?
- 14 A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

23

- Q. And they, in fact, complained that you were interfering with their criminal investigation; correct?
- 17 A. That was their complaint.
- Q. And the charges that were preferred against you -and December 14th, 2014, that was long before you
  received a subpoena for this trial; correct?
- A. The charges were not preferred. The charges were preferred on January 23rd of 2015.
  - **Q**. Right. We'll get to that, Lieutenant. But the incident itself was December 14th, 2014; correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. And then subsequent to that, the State Police makea complaint against you to Providence; correct?
  - A. The State Police showed up at my station the next day trying to discuss what they thought that they --
  - **Q.** Well, the State Police, as a matter of fact, made a complaint to the City of Providence about you; correct?
- 8 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

9

- Q. And based upon that complaint, the acting chief preferred charges against you; correct?
- 11 A. Based solely on that complaint, yes.
- 12 Q. Right. Based on the complaint of the State
- 13 Police; right?
- 14 **A**. Yes.
- 15 **Q**. And there was more than one trooper involved; 16 right?
- 17 **A.** Yes.
- 18 Q. And those charges were, you're correct,
- 19 January 23rd, 2015; correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 **Q**. And that was also long before there were any subpoenas issued for this trial; right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Now, then there -- pursuant to the rules and regulations, there was a trial that was set to be held

1 in front of the acting chief; correct? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. And you had a lawyer? You were allowed to have 4 your own lawyer; right? 5 Α. Yes. 6 Q. And you did have your lawyer; right? 7 Α. I had a lawyer, yes. 8 Q. And you were allowed -- your lawyer was allowed to 9 cross-examine witnesses, including the troopers; 10 correct? 11 Α. The witnesses that were allowed to attend. 12 requested a number of witnesses, and they were not 13 allowed to attend. 14 Q. But the witnesses who did attend, you were Okay. 15 allowed -- your lawyer was allowed to cross-examine; 16 right? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And at that hearing it was alleged, was it not, 19 that you had told the patient if he went to the 20 hospital, he'd have less a chance of being arrested; 21 correct? 22 Α. That was what was alleged, yes. 23 Q. And that the State Police was basing that on what 24 the patient told them in his statement; correct?

25

Α.

Based upon -- yes.

1 Q. And you had the hearing, and then there was a 2 decision: correct? 3 Yes. A decision was made last week, over a year 4 and a half later. 5 Well, the decision was made on -- the decision was Q. dated March 16th, 2016; correct? 6 I don't know. I received word that there was a 7 Α. 8 decision made last week. 9 Q. All right. And then you were served with the 10 decision. When were you served with the decision? 11 Α. March 30th. Yes. 12 Q. March 30th you were served with it? 13 Α. Yes. 14 MR. McHUGH: Your Honor, may I have this 15 identified for identification, marked for 16 identification as Exhibit P. 17 THE COURT: Sure. 18 MR. McHUGH: Please. 19 THE CLERK: Do you want to use ELMO? 20 MR. McHUGH: I will. 21 Oh, you don't have it marked. THE CLERK: 22 MR. McHUGH: No, I don't. This just came up. 23 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, when the exhibit is 24 marked, the Plaintiff requests sidebar.

Okay. Well, let's get it

25

THE COURT:

identified. 1 2 MR. McHUGH: So this will be for the witness 3 only, then. (Defendant's Exhibit P marked for ID.) 4 5 Lieutenant, if you look at the screen in front of Q. 6 you, I'm going to put this document on it, and I want 7 you to read it; and as you read what's on the screen 8 and finish reading it, could you tell me when you're 9 finished so I can turn to the next page, please. 10 THE COURT: Lieutenant, do you recognize the 11 document that's on the screen before you? 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. 13 THE COURT: What is it? In general, what is it? 14 THE WITNESS: That's the opinion of the chief 15 that they gave me last week. 16 THE COURT: That you received last week? 17 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Is there an objection to its 19 introduction, Mr. Martin? 20 MR. MARTIN: Objection. 21 I'll hear you at sidebar. THE COURT: 22 (Bench conference held on the record.) 23 What's the objection, John? THE COURT: 24 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, this is a 403 25 objection. There's never a neutral hearing. There's

no neutral finding. There's no judicial finding.

These are findings of fact made after an administrative proceeding of a chief who is also an adverse party in this case.

Second of all, it's hearsay. It's signed by Commissioner Pare, and it includes his summary of statements from witnesses. So it's hearsay within hearsay.

MR. McHUGH: This is the order of suspension.

Now, there was a witness on the stand, their witness, not mine, who brought this up; and her allegations are that she was suspended because she was a part of this case, a witness in this case.

This is the order of suspension and what the suspension was based upon. She's already testified to much of this.

As far as hearsay, it's a government record, a business record; but I think that the Defendants ought to be able to put this in through evidence so that the jury could see that this rebuts what she says, that she was only suspended and reprimanded because she's a witness in this case.

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the objection.

The matters you brought up, John, you can bring up

during redirect.

1 MR. McHUGH: Thank you, your Honor. (End of bench conference.) 2 3 THE COURT: Mr. McHugh, do you offer it as a full exhibit? 4 I do, your Honor. 5 MR. McHUGH: 6 THE COURT: Defendant's Exhibit P is admitted as 7 a full exhibit and can be shown to the jury. 8 (Defendant's Exhibit P admitted in full.) 9 MR. McHUGH: Do you want me to hand it to the 10 jury, your Honor, or have them look at it on the ELMO? 11 THE COURT: I don't think handing it to them 12 would do them much good unless we sat here for an hour 13 while each one read it. So why don't you make use of 14 the technology as best you can. 15 Mr. McHugh, it might make more sense if you 16 posed -- highlighted parts that you wanted to draw to 17 the witness's attention, and that way the jury can --18 they'll have the full document with them, but it seems 19 a rather long document for all of us to sit here while 20 they read it. 21 Q. Lieutenant, can you look at the document in front 22 of you on the screen, please. And I want to draw your 23 attention to the fourth paragraph where it says "the 24 charges allege." Do you see that? 25 Α. Yes.

- Q. And if you go down to the third sentence, "While on the scene, there was a verbal altercation between Acting Rescue Captain Danielle Masse and a member of the Rhode Island State Police." You do agree with
- 6 A. No, I don't.

that; correct?

5

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 7 Q. You don't agree with that?
- 8 A. No. I don't agree with the wording of this document at all.
- 10 **Q**. Well, you don't agree that there was a verbal altercation between you and a trooper?
- A. No, I would not describe my statement to the trooper as a verbal altercation.
- 14 **Q**. Okay. Would you describe his statement to you as a verbal altercation?
- A. I would describe his communication to me asabusive and condescending.
  - Q. All right. And you see here it says, "It was reported to the chief of the fire department that Acting Rescue Captain Masse repeatedly asked the operator of the vehicle to go with her to the hospital for treatment." You agree with that?
  - A. No.
  - Q. You asked the patient more than once, didn't you?
- 25 A. I asked him if he felt he needed to go to the

1 hospital and what his injuries were.

- **Q**. Okay. You asked him more than once; correct?
- A. Yes.

- **Q.** All right. And then the -- did the trooper, as it says here, approach you for information as to the questions that you were asking him?
- A. No.
  - **Q**. All right.
  - A. I asked the patient multiple times about needing to go to the hospital and what his injuries were because he wasn't responding appropriately and I was having trouble getting the information from him and I was trying to ascertain whether or not the patient was competent to sign a refusal.

The trooper came up to me and started yelling at me, asking me how long it takes to sign a refusal, hurry up, let's get this done, sign the refusal and let's go in a very demeaning, derogatory tone while he was close enough to spit in my face.

- Q. Well, that's a verbal altercation; correct?
- A. No, because I did not interact with the trooper.
- It was a one-way altercation. An altercation would mean that there was a back-and-forth.
  - **Q**. Okay. If you look at page 2, do you have that in front of you?

**A**. Yes.

- Q. I want to direct your attention to on Sunday,December 14th, that afternoon.
  - A. Yes.
  - **Q**. You subsequently learned there had been a 911 call about this car operating erratically. You remember I asked you about that a few minutes ago?
  - A. This document is written out of time order. None of this information was available to me until a few months later, about, like I said, eight months later during the hearing.
  - Q. Well, I understand that, but I know -- I understand also that when you came upon the scene, the car was there, this car was there, it had crashed, correct, and there were state troopers there?
    - A. I responded to a car accident, yes. This BOLO and whatever ensued with the State Police prior to my arrival I was not aware of until months later. All I knew is I was entering an accident scene on the highway and had no other information --
  - **Q**. Okay.
  - A. -- about how it happened.
- Q. Let's look at page 3. If you look at page 3, the second paragraph, the last sentence. Bertrand, he was the patient; correct?

A. Yes, Bertrand was the patient.

Q. "Bertrand eventually told the troopers in his statement and at the hospital that Masse communicated to him if he went to the hospital, he would avoid being arrested." You knew -- you learned that Bertrand told the State Police that; right?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And is this the part of this incident you're talking about in the first sentence in the next paragraph, "When Trooper Emerson inquired what was wrong, Masse snapped at him, ordering him to stand back so that she could do her job"?
- A. Trooper Emerson never inquired what was wrong.
- **Q**. Okay. Is that the trooper you said you asked to step back?
  - A. Yes.
  - **Q.** Okay. And then finally on the next page, page 4, under Charge 1, they cite violation of rules and regulation, "Members shall be governed by customary rules of good behavior." Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
  - **Q**. And so on that one, the chief found the charges sustained because he found that you engaged in an unprovoked verbal altercation with the state trooper; correct?

A. I don't understand what your question is.

Q. Well, in Charge 1 -- there were two charges.

Charge 1, the chief sustained that charge after he heard the evidence, and he based that on the fact that he believed that you engaged in an unprovoked verbal altercation with one of those troopers?

A. As far as I'm aware, this paper came from your office after the people that your office sent to run this hearing, they wrote this up. And what I'm being charged with is what your office recommended I get charged with.

So I don't know if the chief is the one who actually determined that. Well, I know the chief didn't determine that because this paper was given to the chief with recommendations from your office.

Q. Well --

- A. And that's the wording that your office chose.
- **Q**. Well, the chief, Chief Mello, he's the one who held the hearing; correct?
- A. This paperwork -- Chief Mello last week told me that this paperwork got to his hands because Commissioner Pare had taken over as acting chief of the department. And so he was sitting for the hearing, and then Commissioner Pare I guess in conjunction with your office handled this over the last year.

- Q. Well, in any event, you received that punishment
   because Charge 1 was sustained; correct?
   A. I guess that's true.
  - **Q.** Okay. And then if you look at Charge 2 down below, Charge 2 was sustained; correct?
- A. Obviously, for them to file charges, they wouldhave had to agree with what you wrote down here, yes.
  - Q. Well, I didn't write anything down here.
  - A. Well, your office. I apologize.
- Q. And then if you look at the last page of this,
  what you were served with as you already testified to,
  I believe, this was the punishment. You were suspended
  without pay for 10 days. You already started that
  suspension; correct?
- 15 A. Yes.

5

8

- 16 **Q**. And you were receiving a letter of reprimand. Did
  17 you get that yet?
- A. No. Apparently that goes in my permanent file. I don't know if I get to read that.
- Q. Okay. And you were removed from the rescue captains' list; correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23  $\mathbf{Q}$ . Now, at the time that --
- THE CLERK: Thank you.
- MR. McHUGH: Thank you.

- Q. By the time you had received this, you had already filed your own Human Rights complaint against the city; correct?
  - **A**. Absolutely.
  - Q. And in that Human Rights complaint, you alleged discrimination; correct?
- 7 **A.** Yes.

5

- Q. And you're represented by Mr. Martin and Mr. Braga in that complaint; correct?
- 10 A. I am.
- 11 **Q**. And you're here today to support the case of your 12 friend. Lori Franchina: correct?
- A. I'm here to support making sure that it's known how women are treated on the Providence Fire

  Department, yes.
- Q. And you know that Lori Franchina is asking this jury to award her money; correct?
- 18 A. I don't know what the terms are of this trial.
- Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you this. Don't you think that if Lori Franchina wins this case, it will help you win your case?
- 22 A. The issues in my case?
- Q. Well, I'm asking you about your own case. If Lori
  Franchina wins this case, don't you think this would
  help you in your own case?

- 1 A. I think my case speaks for itself.
- 2 Q. Okay. That's fine. But I'm asking you if Lori
- 3 Franchina is found on her behalf -- if a jury finds on
- 4 Lori Franchina's behalf, I'm sure you think that would
- 5 help your case, also.
- 6 A. I'm not quite sure I understand.
- 7 Q. You know what Lori Franchina's alleging; correct?
- 8 **A**. Yes.
- 9 **Q**. And you know what you're alleging; correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 **Q**. And they're similar; right?
- 12 **A.** Yes.
- 13 Q. And they're both against the fire department;
- 14 correct?
- 15 **A.** Yes.
- 16 Q. So don't you think if Lori Franchina prevailed
- 17 here with this jury that would help you prevail in your
- 18 case with a jury?
- 19 A. I don't think that has anything to do with why I
- 20 filed my charges.
- 21 Q. Well, I'm not saying that; but it has to do with
- 22 why you're here today testifying, doesn't it?
- 23 A. They're related, yes.
- 24 Q. Okay. And you're going to ask for money for your
- 25 case; correct?

1 Α. I'm going to ask for the situation that's going on 2 to be dealt with appropriately. 3 Q. And you're going to be asking for compensation; 4 correct? 5 That hasn't been discussed. Α. 6 Q. Well, aren't you going to ask for the 10 days' pay 7 that you lost through this suspension? 8 I am absolutely going to ask for these to be 9 overturned. 10 Q. Okay. And if Lori Franchina were able to get 11 money from this jury, wouldn't that help you in your 12 mind get money from a jury in your case? 13 Α. That is not in my mind, no. 14 MR. McHUGH: All right. Thank you, Lieutenant. 15 Nothing further. 16 Thank you, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. McHugh. Mr. Martin. 18 MR. MARTIN: Briefly. Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Vickie, do you have Defendant's P for Mr. Martin? 20 21 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. 22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. MARTIN: 24 Q. Just a couple of things I wanted to clear up. As

far as the process through which these charges went

that you just discussed with Mr. McHugh, is the process over?

A. No.

- 4 **Q**. What's the next step?
- A. The union has to file a grievance, which they've told me that most likely will immediately be denied; and that goes, I guess, to Commissioner Pare because he's acting as the chief of the department and Mr. McHugh's office; and after that, I can file an appeal.
- 11 **Q**. And do you know if you were to win the appeal what vou'd be entitled to?
- 13 **A**. I don't.
- Q. It says that the within matter came for a hearing before Scott Mello, the acting chief of the department.

  Did I read that correctly?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 **Q**. Was there a neutral arbiter or a judge who made this decision?
- A. I believe the city hired Vinnie Ragosta to represent the city; and another person, I don't know his name, came from --
- 23 Q. Well, sure, those are the prosecutors --
- 24 **A**. Right.
- 25 Q. -- who questioned you?

A. Right.

- **Q**. But it says the hearing came before Scott Mello; right? And then above that it says that it's the opinion of the chief?
- A. Right.
- **Q**. Do you know who made this decision?
- A. The acting chief of the department made the decision.
  - **Q**. Okay. Now, could you tell us again what your observations were that led you to believe that this individual was suffering from a head injury or was under the influence of drugs or alcohol.
  - A. He had pinpoint pupils, he had vomit down his shirt, he was very slow to respond and answer the questions, and he wasn't able to actually answer all the questions. I asked him about what was going on and his injuries.

There was significant damage to the vehicle that had hit the barrier. The airbags had deployed. The windshield was broken, which indicates he hit his head into the windshield.

Q. So we talked about -- you talked about with Mr. McHugh things that you learned about after the fact. I'd like you to take a look at the trooper's observations of Mr. Bertrand here. Do you see where it

1 says that he also noted a stain on his shirt? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. But was unable to ascertain what it was? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Did you notice that he also noticed the pupils to Q. 6 be extremely constricted or pinned? Α. Yes. 7 8 Q. Did you notice that he also noticed that 9 Mr. Bertrand's speech was severely slurred and 10 thick-tongued? Α. 11 Yes. 12 And what's this part about the presence of knotted 13 plastic bag ends? 14 Α. I don't know about that because while I was on 15 scene with the patient and at the hospital, there was 16 no -- that information came after. After I got to the 17 hospital, then they finally did a pat-down on him and 18 found drugs in his socks and I guess in the car. 19 Q. And the trooper also came to the conclusion that 20 Mr. Bertrand was under the influence of a narcotic? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. Now, can you explain to us in your profession what 23 is the protocol that you're supposed to follow in order 24 to determine whether or not one of your patients is

competent to refuse consent for medical care.

A. There's an altered mental -- there's a couple of different protocols. It's an altered mental consciousness protocol and then just -- also just basic EMS. Like, the first week of EMT school teaches about consent and the rights of consent.

And then there's a list of criteria for signing refusals on the state form that has to be met; and one of the criteria that has to be met on the state form states, you know, that the patient is not altered by drugs or alcohol or intoxicating substances. And you have to be able to say "yes" to all those things in order to sign a refusal for the patient.

- **Q**. Was there any reason that you didn't want Mr. Bertrand to get arrested?
- **A**. No.
- **Q**. Had you ever met him before?
- **A**. No.

- Q. We've talked a little bit about things you learned after the fact. Is Mr. Bertrand still alive?
- **A.** No.
  - Q. How did he die?
  - A. He died of a drug overdose a few months later.
- Q. Is Lori Franchina's name mentioned anywhere in this document?
- 25 A. No.

When was the last time Lori Franchina worked at 1 Q. the Providence Fire Department? 2 3 MR. McHUGH: Objection, beyond the scope. 4 THE COURT: It's possible. I'm not sure where 5 you're going with it, Mr. Martin. So if you can tie it to the cross-examination, I'll overrule it. 6 7 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I'll ask a better 8 auestion. 9 Q. You were asked some questions about how the results of this case could possibly affect your case. 10 11 Do you remember answering those questions? 12 Yes. Α. When was the last time that Lori Franchina worked 13 Q. 14 for the Providence Fire Department? 15 MR. McHUGH: Same objection. 16 THE COURT: Overruled. 17 Α. It's been a few years. 18 Q. Can you give us an idea of how many years? 19 Α. I believe she retired a year or so ago; but she 20 hadn't actually worked for at least a few years, at 21 least three years, I believe. Are there any events that you plan on complaining 22 about that Ms. Franchina was a witness to? 23 24 Objection, beyond the scope. MR. McHUGH: THE COURT: 25 Overruled.

Are there any events you can think of that you 1 Q. 2 want to complain about that happened to you to which 3 Ms. Franchina was a witness? Α. I don't believe so. 4 5 Q. So this whole deal with the hearing and the opinion and the demotion and the discipline, did 6 7 anybody explain to you why nobody did that to Sean 8 McGarty? Α. No. 9 10 Objection, your Honor. MR. McHUGH: Sustained. 11 THE COURT: 12 Q. Do you know what these are? 13 Α. Those are exam gloves. 14 Q. And when these are soiled, is there a specific way 15 they're supposed --16 MR. McHUGH: Objection, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: He has to finish the question. 18 Q. When these are soiled, is there a specific way 19 that they're supposed to be taken off to protect the 20 people around? 21 THE COURT: Mr. McHugh. 22 MR. McHUGH: Objection. 23 THE COURT: Sustained. 24 MR. MARTIN: Nothing further. Thanks, Mr. Martin. 25 THE COURT:

1 MR. McHUGH: No questions, your Honor. Thank 2 you. 3 THE COURT: Just so we're clear, there is no 4 recross in the trial absent some extraordinary 5 circumstances. 6 Lieutenant Masse, you can step down, ma'am. 7 Thank you. 8 Mr. Martin. 9 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, the Plaintiff calls 10 Lori Franchina. 11 LORI FRANCHINA, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN 12 THE COURT: Ms. Franchina, I think you know the 13 drill having sat here. If you'd just remain standing, 14 and Ms. McGuire will swear you in. 15 THE CLERK: Please state your name and spell 16 your last name for the record. 17 THE WITNESS: Lori Ann Franchina, F-R-A-N-C-H-I-N-A. 18 19 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 20 BY MR. MARTIN: 21 Q. Good afternoon. 22 Α. Good afternoon. 23 Q. So --24 THE COURT: Ms. Franchina, would you just bring 25 it in a little closer. Great. And try and talk right

I know it's uncomfortable. I understand 1 2 that. 3 THE WITNESS: I think it was my voice at first. Mr. Martin. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 Q. So it's come to my attention that I have your 6 place -- your birthplace of origin wrong in the opening 7 statement. Could you please correct that for everyone. 8 Α. Yes. I am from Jamestown, New York. 9 Q. I see. So you didn't grow up in Rhode Island? 10 Α. No. 11 Q. When did you move here? 12 Α. I moved here approximately 24 years ago. 13 Q. Tell me a little bit about growing up in 14 Jamestown. Where did you go to school? 15 I went to Harvey C. Fenner Elementary School in Α. 16 Falconer, New York; and I then attended Falconer High 17 School. Any particular interest or activities you took 18 19 part in high school? 20 Α. I played three sports, basketball, 21 volleyball and softball. I was very active in my class 22 taking part in homecoming, prom, things of that nature. 23 Q. For the basketball and volleyball, were they 24 regulation size --

25

Α.

Yes.

I was a guard.

- 1 Q. Okay. After high school, where did you go?
- 2 A. Eastern Connecticut State University.
- Q. All right. And what did you study? What was your major?
- A. I studied exercise science, applied anatomy,kinesiology.
- 7 Q. Can you say that a tad bit slower.
- 8 A. Exercise science, applied anatomy and kinesiology.
- 9 I also have three minors, coaching, athletic training 10 and secondary ed. Actually, that's a major. I'm
- 11 sorry.
- 12 **Q**. What is the exercise science/kinesiology?
- A. It's a physical education degree with a secondary major in education, secondary ed.
- Q. Are there -- does that include medical-related course work, anatomy, things of that nature?
- A. Extensive anatomy, kinesiology, motor movement analysis, adaptive physical education.
- 19 **Q**. Did you play any sports in college?
- 20 **A**. I did.
- 21 **Q**. What did you play?
- 22 A. Basketball and softball.
- 23 **Q**. Tell us about your softball experience.
- 24 A. My softball experience started when I was six.
- 25 Q. Tell us about the Eastern Connecticut State

1 University softball.

- A. I played two sports there, but softball was my predominant sport. I loved it. I played four years.
- 4 And in 1992 I suffered 34 facial fractures by breaks,
- 5 and I was an All-American. I continued to play two
- 6 sports.
- 7 **Q**. You had your face broken?
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 **Q**. I'm sorry. Can you explain the -- that was not 34 separate incidents.
- 11 **A**. No.
- 12 Q. That was -- can you explain the 34 fractures.
- A. Sure. I was in a practice setting, and a team

  member let go of a bat. It flew approximately 15 feet,
- 15 striking me predominantly in my nose and my left side
- of my face. And I had a LeFort fracture, which my
- 17 upper jaw was completely movable. I lost several
- teeth, and I had five major breaks.
- 19 **Q**. So how long did it take before you got back to the 20 field?
- 21 A. Seven months.
- Q. And what were the -- tell us about the results for the team during the --
- A. My team had gone on to a national tournament in Pella, Iowa, and took third, I believe, that year.

Q. And the next year?

A. We took second.

- Q. Now, after you graduated, what did you do for work? Oh, wait. What about the Olympics? Tell us about the Olympics.
- A. In 1994 I tried out -- well, I was actually recruited. I had gotten a letter to participate in the open trials, and that was due to my playing experience for the Lady Shamrocks out of Tonawanda, New York.

I played for a former Celtic at the time in the '60s, Larry O'Connor, and we played against a more familiar team in this area in Connecticut, the Robusto Breakouts. So through that experience, I was given an opportunity to try out for the 1994 open trials, and that was held at Springfield College.

- **Q**. And before we transition to your professional career, tell me about your family. Who did you live with when you grew up?
- A. I lived with my mother, Terry Lee Franchina; Anthony Franchina, my father; my brother, Anthony Franchina, Jr.; and Amy Lynn Erickson, formerly Franchina.
- **Q**. What does your dad do for work?
- A. My dad early on was a construction worker and eventually proceeded to continue my grandfather's trade

1 as a cobbler.

- **Q.** How about mom?
- A. Mom was a nurse of 42 years.
  - **Q**. Did you have any jobs throughout school and college?
  - A. Uh-huh. My first job was around the age of 12 with my brother, a paper route. We had a double route because, well, my brother always wanted to do more than the next guy. So with two of us, we could have more papers making more money.
  - Q. Any other jobs in high school or college?
  - A. Yes. I worked for my father. Both my brother and I would shine shoes and help glue and do different things that was, we call it, the family trade, he, too, being a cobbler. So we would do that, get paid a little bit for it here and there.

But I also worked for Parks and Recreations in town. I was a mentor to students, student athletes, did arts and crafts and, you know, sporting events, you know, activities. I was a lifeguard for a pool in one of the nicer areas of town.

- **Q**. What is your sexual orientation?
- A. I am a lesbian.
  - Q. When -- does your family know that?
- **A**. Oh, yes.

Q. When did you tell your family?

A. I think growing up my family always knew my sexual orientation differed from my brother and my sister. It was really discussed my freshman year.

I had returned home for the summer. I was painting my mother's pantry, and she came in and said, I have to ask you a question. I said, Well, ask the question. And she says, Are you? And I said, Am I what?

But being a mom, you know, she just wanted to hear, you know, that I had grown up and was making decisions on my own, living away from home 10 hours.

My school was 10 hours away. So I then prompted to say that I was gay.

- **Q**. And how did your family receive that?
- A. My brother said, I thought so. My sister said, I thought so. My mom was -- she was good. I mean, she was good to the extent that she expressed her concerns, how I might be treated in society even back in the '90s, I guess.
- **Q.** How about dad?
- A. Dad, you know, I think dad is the guy that always, you know, he walked my sister down the aisle with such pride. I don't think he had the foresight to see the way society has come today and how far we are

progressing.

So he was a little reluctant to celebrate; but, I mean, to accept me as a daughter, there was no question. He accepted me.

- **Q**. So let me get back to your transition after college. What was your first job?
- A. Let's see. Well, before I graduated college I was employed by Windham Tech Regional High School. Because of my facial injury, I had to extend my academic career because I chose to play one more year athletically to get my four years in at the university.

So in doing so, I had to extend my academics by both a fall and a spring semester. So, therefore, in my winter phase of academics, I didn't have anything to do. So I applied for the volunteer coaching position for basketball under Raymond Elliot. He became a strong mentor for coaching for me. And also I was the head volleyball coach at the high school. That was in my senior year of college.

- Q. And then after college?
- A. After college, I always worked in the summers. I worked at Lake Compounce, and then after college my first employment opportunity was substitute teaching and working for Natural Bodies Fitness Center.

So I would open up a gym sometimes as early as

4:30 in the morning, get a little workout in possibly and shoot off to substitute teach in Hartford, Connecticut. And then after school, I would return home; and if it was in the fall of that year, I coached at Assumption College.

So I would open a gym at 4:30, teach, and then I'd literally hop on 395 and go to Assumption College and coach until five, six, seven o'clock at night.

- **Q**. And for those of us who are not familiar with the Paris of central Massachusetts, could you tell everyone where Assumption College is.
- A. You continue up 395 to I90 to 290, and you then go through the City of Worcester to the upper right-hand portion of the city of Worcester, which has 10 colleges in it. It's a big city.
- **Q**. And then when did you first feel attracted to or interested in emergency medicine?
- A. That actually came very early. Prior -- I think it was my sophomore year in college. I was home for the summer, and I would go and see my mother for lunch at the hospital.

And on my way there one day, I actually saw a seven-year-old little girl get hit by a car. I was the car behind it. And, again, we always say we -- you know, there's some that run to the fire and there's

some that run away.

I had also taken First Aid and CPR in college, I already had that under my belt, and lifeguard training which I had done in the summers prior to college; and I helped in that scenario prior to a rescue coming.

- **Q**. And when was your -- what was your first job involving emergency medical response?
- A. I worked for -- well, I volunteered as a volunteer firefighter in the Town of Scituate, Rhode Island, and I was at Station 20 there. I worked Mondays and Wednesday nights, volunteered 6A to 6P. Excuse me, 6P to 6A.
- Q. When did you volunteer?
- A. That was in the years -- for two-and-a-half years when I lived in the Town of Scituate, and that was -- I graduated '95, so that would have been '97, '98 into '99.
- **Q**. And then what did you do after '99?
- 19 A. Employment-wise or EMS?
  - **Q**. Both, please.
- A. Okay. At that time -- well, prior to that I was a college coach.
  - Q. Tell us about that.
- A. Well, once I left Assumption College in 1995, I
  went on to coach and moved to the State of Rhode

- 1 Island. I was 25 years old, and I was coaching
- 2 Division I softball at the University of Rhode Island
- 3 for Melissa Jarrell.
  - **Q**. How long did that last?
- 5 A. That was about a year and a half. It's about four semesters.
  - **Q**. Did you continue to acquire any more experience in emergency medicine?
  - A. Yes.

7

8

9

22

23

- 10 **Q**. How so?
- 11 A. I took my EMT-Basic course shortly after that;
- 12 and I was also working then at Providence College as
- an assistant softball coach, and I was licensed as an
- 14 EMT-Basic working for Universal Ambulance on
- 15 Douglas Ave. in Providence, Rhode Island.
- 16 **Q**. What did you do for Universal Ambulance?
- 17 A. I was an EMT-Basic.
- Q. And for -- give me the timeline starting and ending when you were working for Universal.
- A. Universal Ambulance was approximately around 1998 to 2001 and a half, like half of 2001.
  - **Q**. Over the course of that time, did you earn any professional certificates or go through any trainings related to emergency medicine?
- 25 A. I had actually started my EMT-Cardiac at that

time, it's a secondary license, and intubation. I was
certified in intubation.

- **Q**. So now you've taken us up, I think you said, to around 2000 to 2002. What was your next job?
- A. I actually worked -- well, I worked at a couple gyms, too, during that time period. So I don't know if I was still working at Fitness -- excuse me, Suburban Fitness in Scituate.

So then after that my transition went away from fitness and really honed in and applied to the Providence Fire Department.

**Q**. Okay. When did you apply?

- A. It was the summer before the -- actually, that was in -- I think that sitting was in 2000. I was still working for Universal Ambulance at the time.
  - **Q**. When was your academy?
  - A. My academy was the -- there was two academies drawn out of one test. So 2,300 people sat for a test. Eight hundred people, men and women, were chosen for the agility. Out of 800, 80 passed the fitness test. My score was very high amongst the men with the agility. It's a time test, has to be completed in under six minutes. I was 4:16.
  - **Q**. So when you say it was very high among the men, what do you mean?

- 1 A. My score compared with men taking that agility test.
- 3 Q. Oh, they publish the scores?
- 4 A. No, they told us the times.
- 5 Q. So first there's a written test, you said, of
- 6 2,300?
- 7 **A.** Uh-huh.
- 8 **Q**. Yes?
- 9 A. Yes. I'm sorry. Yes.
- 10  $\mathbf{Q}$ . And 800 were selected for the agility test?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 **Q**. And then 80 were selected for the academy?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. When did the academy start?
- A. I was chosen in the second portion of that academy.
- $\mathbf{Q}$ . What does that mean?
- A. There was 45 selected for the academy, and that
  was the 45th academy, and that academy ran one year
  prior to mine. Mine started -- that started in March
  of '91 for them and March 18th, I believe, in 1992 for
  us. Excuse me, 2002. Whoa. I would have been really
  young. Sorry.
- Q. So what's the academy like? Do you live there?

  Do you commute?

A. It is a five-day-a-week academy. At the training academy, you have to arrive -- as they say, on time is late. So you have to arrive early and be prepared.

It's a paramilitant organization. We are the second oldest fire department in the country. We learn our history, it's extensive, from rerouting the rivers here in Providence to the Bucket Brigade.

So we come in early, and we stay until 5:00 usually five days a week. We are paid minimum wage for that time period.

- Q. Where is the academy located?
- 12 A. I'm not sure of the exact address, but it's at the Reservoir Ave. firehouse.
  - **Q**. What's the first oldest fire department?
  - A. Cincinnati.

- Q. So what types of things did you learn there?
- A. We learned Firefighter 1001, Firefighter 1002. If you're not already EMT-Basic certified, you receive your EMT-Basic certification in the course.
- I, on the other hand, had my EMT-Cardiac already, so I became like a student helper. There was about four of us that already had our cardiacs, so we could aid our, you know, our group.

We all want to get through it together. We all want to pass, and some -- there were some that

struggled because the EMT-Basic is a very difficult course, a lot to learn in a very short amount of time.

- **Q**. Is there some type of test or certification that happens at the end that is required before being employed by the department?
- A. Yes, absolutely. We have to take Firefighter 1001 exams, which are national, the NFPA standards.
- Everybody is certified across the country.

Firefighter 1001, Firefighter 1002.

You have to pass your national certification for EMT-Basic. I already had my cardiac at the time. We are high-angle certified. We rappel from eight stories. That's where my class jumped from.

**Q**. High-angle certified?

- A. Yup, ropes. We have to be able to rappel off the side of a building. We also have to -- I believe, and Captain LaRoche can testify to this, but I believe we're the only one that can -- we use pompier ladders still for our training purposes only.
- **Q**. You use a what?
- A. A pompier ladder. It's a single-rung ladder with a loose neck hook that goes through a window, catches the edge of the windowsill, and you free-climb one story, and you can lock off.

And the theory is you pass another ladder up the

side of the building. You then have to manipulate it, 1 2 get it into a window, unharness, climb, free-climb 3 scaling the side of the building. It's called a 4 scaling latter, pompier. 5 Q. Huh. 6 I thought it was fun. You had to do that? 7 Q. 8 Α. Yes. 9 Q. So there's a written component and a physical 10 component? 11 Α. Absolutely. 12 Q. Of the 80 who entered your academy, do you know 13 how many eventually entered the department? 14 Α. No. We had several that failed. 15 Q. How did you get along with everybody in the 16 academy? 17 Α. I got along great. I mean, I had a great time. 18 Q. What do you mean you had a great time? 19 Α. I enjoyed everything I learned. I took it in like 20 a sponge. I wrote a lot of things down. I had study 21 groups at my house. Guys and girls would come. 22 was two other females in my academy. They would attend 23 my house. I lived alone at the time. I had a pretty 24 big house. My dogs were nice to get along with.

Who were the two other girls in your academy?

25

Q.

- A. Andrea Stuckus and Heidi Davis. Her name now isHeidi Kennedy.
- Q. What was your relationship like with Andrea
  Stuckus during the academy?
- 5 A. Excellent.
- 6 **Q**. Was it purely platonic?
- 7 **A.** No.

- **Q**. Any problems with Andrea after the academy?
- A. I think because of our relationship in the academy
  she chose to distance herself and create more of a, you
  know, environment that excluded me.
- Q. And you mentioned that in your study group and in your social group there were also males. Did you have any male friends while you were in the academy?
- 15 A. Absolutely.
- 16 **Q**. Like who?
- A. Ethan McCauley, Brian Belhumeur, Danny Imarone,Stephen Whalen.
- Q. Were you here when Attorney McHugh on behalf of the city did his opening statement?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you hear about complaints that you had made during the academy?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 **Q**. Could you tell us about those.

A. One in particular caught me off guard. The women -- there was three women in our academy. The rest were men. And during housekeeping, women are -- we have four platoons similar to on the job. We have an A, B and C and D Group, and that was the same in the academy. I was part of A Group. And so each group, you know, academy group, was assigned a specific area of the building to clean.

So from 0800 hours to 0900 hours, we were required to, you know, polish brass, clean the urinals, clean the facilities, mop floors, dust, anything the chief wanted taken out garbage-wise or anything that, you know, they can have us do, we did. We cleaned the apparatus floor. So there was a lot of -- tools.

You know, we learned how to prepare for our environment that we were entering, to prepare to go into the stations; and, you know, if a guy or a girl had been doing it for 18 to 20 years, well, you wanted to be comparable.

So in our training academy, I mean, it might sound silly, but we had to learn how to do housekeeping, you know. So -- oh, on that incident. I'm sorry.

**Q**. That's fine. So you're referring to training regarding the -- taking care of the latrine?

A. So we were in there that day. In particular, my group had been assigned the upstairs; and that included our classroom, another back storage room, two offices and a bunk room that we would eventually be using for overnights and working, you know, hands-on, on-the-job training and also the second floor bathroom that was specifically marked men; but when a woman was assigned to clean it, I felt, you know, I could enter that and do my job.

And at the time that I was cleaning a toilet, I heard urinating right next to me. And I said, Whoa, guys. First, I don't believe we complained. I believe that we addressed it. I'm not really sure how it went, but I made it aware that we can't do that.

You know, I was 30 years old. I had several jobs. I was already a Division I coach for six years. I had been in the field of service, you know; and maybe somebody younger than me, a male that wasn't, you know, with his head on straight up to that, you know, up to, you know, social acceptances, I felt needed to just be told, Look, you can't do this. And, you know, it was brought right up the chain.

- **Q**. And was it taken care of after that?
- A. Yeah, absolutely. They asked us if we had any problems, if I felt like I was sexually harassed in any

- way, and I said no. I just felt like maybe it just
  needed to be addressed so that we all could move on and
  get over it.
  - **Q**. Does that have any part with the claims that you're bringing here in this lawsuit?
  - A. No.

- **Q**. Were there any other complaints that you made about how you were treated during the academy?
  - A. Not that I'm aware of, unless you direct it. I'm not aware.
  - **Q**. Do you recall having any problems or anything that you were unhappy with dealing with other people in the academy?
  - A. No. Like I said, I took a lot of notes, and several of the men noticed that, and we started study groups where some of them had children and because I didn't have children, they would come to my house. It was quiet. We could -- you know, I had a big table down in my basement. It was actually a pool table, and we could throw all our books on it and just kind of get everything out there and start -- you know, we did a lot of brainstorming, a lot of, you know, questions, answers kind of thing so that we would -- it was a very physical job.
  - **Q**. So your graduation must have been exciting.

A. Yes.

Q. Tell us about that.

A. I graduated tenth overall. I felt super proud.

My brother and my father are cobblers. My mom's a

nurse. My sister's an accountant. I have one cousin
that's a firefighter in Jamestown.

And I felt like I hit the lottery, that I -- I mean, I had a job with a pension. I had a job doing what I loved, EMS. And, you know, in the training academy I was paired up with a training number one, Brian Belhumeur, just to go back a little bit to give you an idea of my excitement; but they changed the training trailer on us to try and kind of -- he was the same size as me, and I just challenged myself. If he led the way, I was going in any burning building or anything to try and just stay up with him and, you know, just learn. It was so exciting.

So when we graduated, there was a corps of us that really had comradery. We enjoyed ourselves. We -- I don't know. I was treated well. I didn't have any complaints.

- **Q**. Where was your first assignment when you transitioned from the academy to the department?
- A. Ladder 1, LaSalle Square.
- **Q**. Ladder 1 at LaSalle Square?

1 A. Yes.

2

- **Q**. What was your job?
- 3 A. I was a ladderman or ladderwoman.
  - **Q**. Is that what it's called, a ladderman?
- 5 A. Yeah. I was on the ladder. That was my truck.
- 6 **Q**. So what does a ladderman do?
- 7 A. Well, we do forceful entry. We attack the roof.
- 8 We ventilate. You know, we use K12 saws. We do
- 9 extrication of -- Jaws of Life. We're called to car
- 10 accidents.
- 11 If you're on a, you know, a truck with a deck
- 12 gun, I mean, you could be preserving, you know,
- exterior. Just like the other night in Providence, we
- 14 had a huge fire and, you know, there's a lot of ladder
- 15 trucks doing exterior exposure, you know, preventing
- them from, you know, igniting by applying water to
- 17 them. Things of that nature.
- 18 Q. Did you personally fight any fires?
- 19 A. In the academy, I was in two fires. And, yeah, my
- 20 first week on the job, I had a dryer fire, a
- 21 laundromat. It wasn't one dryer. It's a lot of
- 22 dryers. And, yeah, I was on that fire.
- 23 Q. How long were you a ladderman at the LaSalle
- 24 station?
- 25 **A**. One week.

**Q**. One week?

A. Yup.

- Q. And then where did you go?
- A. I was for one cycle -- I was in transition because, coming out of the academy, I had already had my EMT-Cardiac. There was a lot of availability on the rescues.

So, in turn, I eventually just was waiting for my position to open up. Another female had gotten -- was being transferred off a rescue, in fact, Engine 3; and I was waiting for that spot to open up for me for my assignment coming out of the academy, which was Rescue 3, A Group.

- **Q**. When did you start at Rescue 3?
- A. Second week -- third cycle on the job.
- 16 Q. So where was your station?
  - A. Branch Avenue, 10 Branch Ave.
  - **Q**. Can you explain to the jury what we mean when we say "your station."
    - A. I think everybody calls it their station when they're assigned there.
    - **Q**. Being assigned to a station, what does that mean?
    - A. You're assigned to a station long term. It's not temporary in nature. Paperwork comes out from the chief of the department assigning you specifically that

- house and the vehicle. At Branch Avenue, we had a Battalion 3, Engine 2, Ladder 7 and Rescue 3.
- 3 Q. And those are all different vehicles?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. How long were you at Branch Ave.? Let me ask you
- 6 a little better question. What was the approximate
- 7 day, like month and year, when you started at Branch
- 8 Ave.?
- 9 A. It would have been third cycle. I graduated
- 10 September, I believe, 22nd of 2002. So third cycle,
- 11 you're looking at about -- it's four days on, four days
- 12 off. You do the math.
- 13 **Q**. Okay.
- 14 A. I'm not sure. It was the third cycle.
- 15  $\mathbf{Q}$ . But was that still in 2002?
- 16 A. Oh, yeah. Yeah.
- 17 Q. What does the third cycle mean?
- 18 A. You have a cycle on, four days on, and then you
- 19 have what they call your 96 hours off and then your
- 20 next cycle. So it's just how you, you know, see your
- 21 time, I guess.
- 22 Q. So fall/winter 2002 you started at Branch Ave.?
- 23 A. Uh-huh. Correct.
- 24 **Q**. As an EMT 3?
- 25 A. I was an EMT-Cardiac, and I was assigned the

chauffeur position of Rescue 3.

- Q. So tell us what an EMT-Cardiac is.
- A. I am licensed through the State of Rhode Island as an EMT-Cardiac with certification in intubation. I can start IVs. I'm one level below paramedic. And through Med Control, we can do paramedic procedures through Med Control.
- Q. What's a chauffeur?
- A. A chauffeur in the Providence Fire Department is someone that is designated to drive a vehicle. For rescues, you get a permanent chauffeur position for six months, typically, at a time; but you can be also detailed into a vehicle to be a chauffeur.

And usually on the engines and the ladders, the men and women do a rotation to be a chauffeur because that requires those individuals to actually drive the truck and be the pump operator if they're called to a fire or, on ladder, you're the driver of the vehicle.

- **Q**. So how did you like the job?
- A. I loved it.
- Q. Whv?
- A. I was doing everything I wanted to do. I was helping people. My mother was a nurse of 42 years, and she would always tell us stories at the dinner table of how she helped people, sometimes in the time of need;

and sometimes she said that, you know, true compassion in those moments, it could just be holding their hand in their last few minutes, to just, you know, washing their hair and taking care of them while their family is not around.

So I saw it as caretaking. I saw it as a strong job. I saw it as something physical. I always liked being outside, more so than an inside job. You know, it was just wonderful. I was everything I wanted to be doing.

- Q. How about your co-workers, how did you like them?
- **A**. Good. Yeah. In 2002, after 9/11, our pipes and drums from New England was honored by leading the 9/11 parade.

Our New England Pipes and Drums got to march first, even before the New York City firefighters. I mean, we're the second oldest fire department in the country. I mean, we were pretty cool.

And to have that honor bestowed upon us, we all boarded trains and headed to New York for the 9/11 memorial. We all got -- well, I don't know about everybody, but Providence got tickets to enter Madison Square Garden for the memorial. I marched with, you know, Chris Lisi, Chris Wagner, Ronnie Lefebvre, Chief Pare, which is now the Attleboro -- I believe he's

still at Attleboro Fire Department in Massachusetts.

He was one of our chiefs. He was my Battalion 3 chief. We actually rode the train together with all the guys. And they took care of me, and they kept me under their wing. They didn't let me -- you know, I'm in a big city. I'm a young kid and a female amongst a lot of drinking and carrying on, and they protected me.

They took me -- like I said, they took me under their wing, kept an eye on me. And then we all stayed together in a hotel room, a lot more than should have been, I think, by code. I'm sorry.

- **Q**. That's fine. And 2003 through 2006, how was the progression of your career or how did you enjoy your work environment during those years?
- A. Those years were difficult because Chief Michael Dillon would call my -- I had soon gone over to North Main Street fire station. I was assigned there on Rescue 5 under Captain David Raymond. He was a senior captain, and I had gone over there to become his chauffeur. And with a year on the job, I was asked to go in charge of a rescue, and I refused.
- **Q**. Why did you refuse?

A. I'm a new guy, you know. I understand the history. I mean, you want to fit in. Even as a guy, to climb rank that quickly just -- unless your father

was on the job, I wouldn't suggest it, nor did I.

And I sent letters to Chief Dillon, and I had my captain, David Raymond, verbally for six months try to keep him at bay and not force me in charge.

- **Q**. What do you mean forced to be in charge? What was all the pressure?
- A. Well, you know, at that time I'm 31 years old. I have great leadership skills. I had coached softball for years at the Division I level. I was competitive in nature but yet, you know, I liked rules. I liked standards, policies. I understood them, I read them, applied them, you know, as a technician.

But as a technician, I was just doing my job, and I was aiding a captain at the time. It felt normal. It felt like what I needed to do. Being forced in charge meant that there's a -- I don't know if it's in the first part of that rules and regulations, but it says for the good of the department, the chief of the department may make -- may move manpower as he sees fit. That's not a quote, but it's the tone of it.

- **Q**. I see. So you said that they were difficult, and then I interrupted you. Could you explain to us what you meant that they were difficult.
- A. What was difficult?

**Q**. I thought that you said that those years were difficult.

- A. Oh, difficult because I had to continuously request that I don't go in charge.
- **Q.** Okay. For how long did you continuously request that you not be put in charge? When you say "put in charge," does that mean a promotion to --
- A. Well, I was acting as an officer in that timeframe. So if a call-back came in for an officer position, I could take that because with -- anyone on the job one year can be in charge of an engine, a ladder or a rescue.

So they only have to have a year experience; and if they are the senior person on that vehicle, they can be bumped up in charge.

That was happening periodically for me already.

And through some situations, I found it to be uncomfortable and, you know, just very tough to, you know, get things done.

Guys with 18 years on the job and been in rescue, one in particular, you know, even said to me, you know, I'll never take an order from you. I had a year and a half on the job. He was 18 years, and I think he had completed almost 15 of those 18 on rescue. He was just transferring, you know, his career from

being a rescue --

MR. McHUGH: I'm going to object at this point, your Honor. This is becoming a free-flowing narrative instead of answering questions.

THE COURT: Why don't we let the witness finish this answer, but we have to be careful about ensuring that we have question and answer, back and forth, Mr. Martin.

A. Firefighter Dicomitis was on rescue for a lot of years; and, in turn, when I was acting in charge in my first year and a half, I was basically told that he'll never take an order from me.

THE COURT: Mr. Martin, actually is this a good time? We're right at 4:30.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Great. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to break for the day. I'm going to give you the usual admonitions. Please don't do any independent research about this case, please don't discuss this case amongst yourselves or with anyone else, please don't mention anything about your jury service on social media and please, please don't look at any news reports about this trial. If you see them, just turn away from them. And we'll see you back at 9:30.

(Adjourned.)

CERTIFICATION I, Karen M. Wischnowsky, RPR-RMR-CRR, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes in the above-entitled case. <u>February 1, 2017</u> Date /s/ Karen M. Wischnowsky\_\_\_\_ Karen M. Wischnowsky, RPR-RMR-CRR Federal Official Court Reporter 

